DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 228 248 TM 820 757

AUTHOR	Dornbusch, Stanford M.; And Others
TITLE	The Collegial Evaluation Program: A Manual for the Professional Development of Teachers. Field Test Edition.
INSTITUTION	Stanford Univ., Calif. Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	76
NOTE	168p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Classroom Observation Techniques; Conferences; Educational Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; *Peer Evaluation; Peer Relationship; *Program Development; Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Student Teachers; *Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Improvement; Teamwork

ABSTRACT

The Collegial Evaluation Program leads to improved teaching by systematizing a way for teachers to obtain frequent, focused feedback from themselves, their students, and their colleagues. The process can be used by a single pair of teachers, a teaching team, a department, or an entire faculty. The purpose of this manual is to introduce the idea of collegial evaluation and provide step-by-step directions for its use. The program is organized into a six-step model of evaluation, each dealt with in a separate section: (1) Getting started: choosing a partner; (2) Student evaluations; (3) Selecting criteria; (4) Self-evaluation; (5) Observations and conferences; (6) A plan for professional development; and (6) Adapting Collegial Evaluation for teacher trainees. (PN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

NOV 11 1976

Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching
School of Education, Stanford University
Stanford, California

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
S. M. Dornbusch

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED228248

Field Test Edition
Fall 1976

THE COLLEGIAL EVALUATION PROGRAM

A Manual for the Professional Development of Teachers

Sanford M. Dornbusch, Terrence E. Deal,
Deborah Plumley, and Susan S. Roper

TM 820 757

These materials have been prepared by the Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching (SCRDT) under a contract with the National Institute of Education, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and are not intended for publication. All rights are reserved. These materials are to be used only by participants in authorized SCRDT field tests and reviews of the materials and are not to be reproduced in whole or in part nor sold, loaned, given away, or otherwise made available to the general public. All copies are the property of SCRDT and must be returned to it whenever the limited purpose of their distribution has been met.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION TO COLLEGIAL EVALUATION 1

Why Now? 1
Is the Process Sound? 2
Is the Process Flexible? 3
How Can Teachers Participate? 3
A Model of Evaluation 3
What's Wrong with Traditional Evaluation? 5
The Concept of Collegial Evaluation 6
Overview of the Collegial Evaluation Program 8
Some Barriers to the Implementation of Collegial Evaluation 9
Overcoming Barriers to Collegial Evaluation 10
Moving Toward Collegial Evaluation 14

SECTION I. GETTING STARTED: CHOOSING A PARTNER 16

Discussing the Pros and Cons of Collegial Evaluation . . 16
Deciding Who Will Participate 17
Selecting or Assigning Partners 18

SECTION II. STUDENT EVALUATIONS 21

SECTION III. SELECTING CRITERIA 25

Sources 25
Examples of Criteria 27
Meeting to Select Criteria 28
Common Problems in Selecting Criteria 32
Suggestions for Choosing Appropriate Criteria 33
Summary 34

SECTION IV. SELF-EVALUATION 36

SECTION V. OBSERVATIONS AND CONFERENCES 40

The First Observation 40
The First Conference 43
The Second Observation 47
The Second Conference 48

SECTION VI. A PLAN FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT 50

Pre-conference Activities 50
The Final Conference 51
Post-conference Activities 53
Examples of Professional Development Plans 54

CONTENTS (Continued)

SECTION VII. ADAPTING COLLEGIAL EVALUATION FOR TEACHER TRAINEES 57

- How Does the Collegial Evaluation Program Benefit Trainees? 59
- Using the Collegial Evaluation Program in Preservice Training 60
- Summary 63

CONCLUSION: IMPROVING THE COLLEGIAL PROCESS 65

INTRODUCTION TO COLLEGIAL EVALUATION

Can teachers help each other to do a better job? We think they can. The Collegial Evaluation Program emphasizes teachers joining together in partnerships to improve the quality of their teaching. This program evolved from a decade-long study of evaluation in schools and other organizations. The results of our research have convinced us that evaluation can help produce good teaching--though it seldom does. We believe that through collegial evaluation, teaching colleagues can improve the quality of their teaching performance and develop their professional skills.

The program is a series of shared activities. Two teachers jointly develop criteria or standards for teaching performance; each teacher assesses his or her own teaching and gets feedback from students; the teachers then observe each other's teaching, discuss their observations in structured conferences, and develop plans for improvement. The Collegial Evaluation Program leads to improved teaching by systematizing a way for teachers to get frequent, focused feedback from themselves, their students, and their colleagues. The process can be used by a single pair of teachers, a teaching team, a department, or an entire faculty. The purpose of this manual is to introduce the idea of collegial evaluation and provide step-by-step directions for its use.

Why Now?

Our application of collegial evaluation to schools comes at a time when state legislatures are demanding that teachers and schools be held accountable for the learning of their pupils.

Schoolteachers and administrators are both experiencing these pressures as one consequence of a general social movement for greater educational accountability, a movement often expressed in state policies. Unfortunately, state-mandated evaluation, which legislators assumed would result in better teaching, has basic weaknesses: (1) the punitive emphasis of evaluation procedures has reduced the usefulness of formal evaluation as a means of improving instruction and (2) the new evaluation programs have failed to involve classroom teachers either in determining whether a colleague's performance is good enough or in suggesting how he or she might improve.

New programs emphasizing student learning (or outcomes) have scarcely been better. The relationship between student outcomes and the quality of teaching is complex and far from being well understood. Student variability is so great that the attempt to evaluate teachers on the basis of student outcomes often tells us more about students--or even about evaluators--than about teachers. Most important, evaluating teaching by assessing student learning faces stiff criticism from teachers who want to know: How will these results help us improve our teaching? These concerns have support in the sports world: "Knowing the final score doesn't help the team improve for the next game."

Collegial evaluation is different--it emphasizes more than other methods the positive side of evaluation, specifically the use of evaluation as a positive approach to professional development. In addition, it can supplement or serve as an alternative to the formal evaluation system.

Is the Process Sound?

The Collegial Evaluation Program evolved from extensive research, and we are convinced that the process is theoretically sound. Even more important, teachers in classroom situations have successfully used the process to improve their teaching. Through workshops, 150 teachers tried the collegial process. A pilot test was conducted with 30 elementary and secondary teachers and teacher trainees who taught in a variety of teaching situations. Overall, these teachers were positive and enthusiastic about collegial evaluation as an approach to improve their teaching. We have incorporated their suggestions about improving the Program, along with many of their comments and hints that they thought would be helpful to others.

Is the Process Flexible?

Peer evaluation is a flexible process that can be tailored to fit different situations. As teachers form partnerships and begin to use collegial evaluation, problems may arise that can best be solved by modifying some aspect of the process. In the pilot test, teachers creatively constructed special student questionnaires, had parents observe class sessions using the shared criteria, observed outstanding teachers, and exchanged students to provide new settings for observations. Such adaptations only make the collegial process better.

How Can Teachers Participate?

Each section of the manual gives specific directions for a step in the process. The manual, a partner, some enthusiasm, and a willingness to invest a little time are the crucial elements for activating the process. Suggestions for organizing broad participation are given in Section I.

A Model of Evaluation

At a minimum, evaluation aimed at improving classroom teaching must have three characteristics: (1) it must not be punitive, (2) it must designate evaluators to supplement the principal's evaluation, (3) it must focus on teaching performance. In this first section we will provide some background information on evaluation in schools by summarizing the inadequacies of existing practices. Then we will explain the concept of collegial evaluation and summarize the evidence of its usefulness in schools and will outline the Collegial Evaluation Program. Finally, we will discuss some barriers to the implementation of collegial evaluation in schools and some ways to overcome them.

Our collegial evaluation model grew from studies of evaluation processes in many different organizations (Dornbusch and Scott, 1975). In the last decade we have studied evaluation processes in diverse situations: an electronics assembly line, a physics research team, hospitals, a Roman Catholic archdiocese, a university faculty, a student newspaper, and even a football team. We have organized the results of these studies in a six-step model of evaluation that applies to all kinds of organizations:

1. Assigning goals
2. Setting criteria or standards
3. Making observations (sampling performance)
4. Appraising performance
5. Communicating appraisals (feedback)
6. Planning a program for improvement.

Our extensive studies of evaluation processes in public schools support the view that the model is applicable to educational organizations. According to this model, the first stage in evaluation is assigning goals or tasks. A teacher, for example, is assigned by a principal the task of teaching reading skills to a given class of students. Second, criteria or standards are set either for outcomes or for performance. For example, 90 percent of the class is expected to reach grade level of skill at the end of the year, or the teacher is expected to use certain behavioral techniques as a main instructional strategy. The third step is observing performance. The principal visits the teacher's class occasionally to see whether or not those behavioral techniques are actually being used. The fourth step is appraising the performance. The principal compares the teacher's performance against a criterion or standard, e.g., determines whether the teacher is using those techniques during half the oral recitation periods. This comparison yields a rating that might range from "very satisfactory" to "needs considerable improvement." In the fifth step of the evaluation process, the appraisal is communicated. The principal tells the teacher: on this particular criterion you need improvement. This might lead to the final phase of the evaluation process--planning a specific program for improving performance in the indicated areas.

The steps of this evaluation model are interdependent; a weakness in any one lessens the contribution that evaluation can make to improving job performance. For example, if the criteria are unclear, the feedback will probably not be useful. If the observations are infrequent, the quality of the appraisals will be questioned and the feedback ignored.

What's Wrong with Traditional Evaluation?

Our educational research provided perceptions of commonly used evaluation processes from 600 teachers and 33 school administrators. This information was sufficient to convince us that weaknesses in one, two, or even all six evaluation steps were common in schools. For example, many teachers reported that they did not know the criteria used to evaluate them, or that the criteria were too vague to be meaningful.

They complained that observations of their classroom teaching were often no more than infrequent peeks into the classroom by the principal. Many said they got no feedback from the principal--though the principal reported conveying his or her evaluations to teachers regularly. Among the teachers we talked with, specific plans for improvement were rare. From these reports, it is not surprising that teachers are anxious about being evaluated and do not believe that evaluation helps improve their teaching.

It would be unfair, however, simply to blame principals for these shortcomings, first since their administrative duties preclude their spending much time observing and conferring with teachers, and second since teachers feel threatened by and do not like being evaluated by a supervisor. Consequently, many administrators prefer to use students' test scores as an indirect means of assessing teacher performance rather than to carry out time-consuming, anxiety-producing classroom observations and teacher conferences.

But while emphasis on student outcomes increases administrative convenience, it does not solve the problems of evaluating teachers. In sum, evaluation programs that rely on the principal as the sole evaluator or on student outcomes as a single means of assessing teacher quality will do little to improve teaching or learning.

The Concept of Collegial Evaluation

Professionals derive much of their status from their having formally assumed responsibility for evaluating one another under the auspices of their occupational associations. Doctors, for example, have the American Medical Association, lawyers the American Bar Association. Both doctors and lawyers have been criticized for infrequently evaluating performance by their colleagues. But, until now, the teaching profession has emphasized collegial review even less than these professions. In fact, some of our studies showed that teachers did not see their colleagues as legitimate evaluators. Nevertheless, teachers are eager to increase their professionalism. Often the path is political. Another route may be found by increasing the visibility of teaching performances to colleagues. With increased visibility, teachers tend to become more willing to evaluate one another's teaching.

Our studies of open space and team teaching revealed that reducing the isolation of classroom teachers altered their professional view of evaluation.[1] Since teaching performance was more visible in the open space classrooms, teachers viewed evaluation of their teaching by their colleagues as more legitimate than they would have in traditional classrooms. As they exchanged evaluations, the teachers developed more respect for the ability of their colleagues to make sound judgments. As a result, they were more willing to have colleagues evaluate their teaching. From these findings, we reasoned that if teachers were given the opportunity to observe one another, they could give each other useful feedback. They would thus become more willing to evaluate each other in the future and would be able to use these regular evaluations to improve their classroom teaching.

---

[1] John W. Meyer and Elizabeth G. Cohen, The Impact of the Open-Space School upon Teacher Influence and Autonomy: The Effects of an Organizational Innovation, Technical Report No. 21 (Stanford, Ca.: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1971); Gwen D. Marram, Sanford M. Dornbusch, and W. Richard Scott, The Impact of Teaming and the Visibility of Teaching on the Professionalism of Elementary School Teachers, Technical Report No. 33 (Stanford, Ca.: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1972).

Not all teachers will be happy with collegial evaluations. But since the present hierarchial structure of evaluations is disenchanting, you may be more enthusiastic about participating in a new approach in which you conduct your own evaluations.

Overview of the Collegial Evaluation Program

In our Collegial Evaluation Program teachers work in evaluation partnerships to improve the quality of their teaching. The program also provides for self-assessment and student assessment. The entire sequence of self- and student assessment, observations, and conferences requires ten to twelve hours spread over a month or two. The program is flexible and can be implemented by an entire faculty, a department, a teaching team, or any two interested teachers.

This manual contains all the directions and forms needed to implement the program. In addition, it explains the rationale for each step, incorporates examples of successful practices from other teachers, and offers suggestions to help teachers get the greatest benefit from this experience. The program consists of seven interrelated steps:

1. Choosing a partner. This partnership between two teaching colleagues is the heart of the program. Qualities to consider in choosing are discussed.
2. Student assessment. A questionnaire is provided to get feedback from students.
3. Selecting evaluation criteria. Teaching standards have to be defined specifically enough to serve as a guide for evaluation. We help by providing examples of criteria used by other teachers.
4. Self-assessment. Each teacher completes a self-evaluation form; it is based partially on the criteria selected and partially on a questionnaire to be given to students.
5. Observations. Observing a colleague's teaching and being observed in turn is the central activity. We have developed forms for making observations based on the selected criteria and tips to improve skills in observing.

6. Conference on observations. After each set of observations, the collegial pair holds a conference to report observations and develop plans for improvement in appropriate areas. The program specifies a structure for the conferences so that each teacher will know how to proceed.
7. The improvement plan. Another conference is held to pull together observations by colleagues, self-assessments, and student assessments. Once again, the structure of the conference is specified and some suggestions are provided for developing a long-term program for improvement.

Some Barriers to the Implementation of Collegial Evaluation

The reasons why most current systems of evaluation don't work are deeply imbedded in the culture and the structure of school organizations--tight, inflexible schedules, isolated classrooms, norms that oppose evaluation, and overwhelming demands on both teachers and administrators. Many of these same conditions will interfere with the implementation of the collegial evaluation process. We therefore want to discuss three broad types of barriers to collegial evaluation: lack of time for observations, lack of experience in constructive evaluation, and beliefs and norms that oppose evaluation.

Time. (a) Teachers may have classroom responsibilities throughout the school day. Without free time, it may be impossible for teachers to observe each other's teaching. (b) Some schools do not have enough money or staff to release teachers for collegial observation (i.e., to provide a substitute for the observer). (c) Principals may not have time to themselves substitute for teachers who wish to observe each other.

Experience. (a) Most teachers have had little experience in exchanging constructive criticism with colleagues about any important aspect of their own teaching. (b) Teachers have not been trained to evaluate teaching. (c) Lack of agreement on teaching standards or criteria is common within many schools and across the entire field of education.

Beliefs and norms. (a) Many teachers share the belief that classrooms are personal domains, out-of-bounds to others except for annual visits from the principal; they feel that their colleagues do not have legitimate rights to evaluate their work. Furthermore, teachers often feel threatened by any evaluation that might conceivably influence the distribution of the principal's rewards or penalties. (b) Many teachers feel that personality, not training or experience, is the most important asset of a good teacher; they often conclude that their teaching cannot, therefore, be improved. (c) Teachers often feel that their time should be spent instructing students, not in evaluating colleagues. (d) Many teachers believe students are not competent to evaluate any aspect of teaching.

These barriers may not exist in every school, and some schools may have others we have not thought of. We have two purposes in discussing them, however: first, some can be eliminated before the Collegial Evaluation Program is begun, and second, awareness of the barriers may help teachers realize that their difficulties in initiating the collegial process are widely shared. They can therefore work on the specific difficulties instead of scrapping the entire process.

Overcoming Barriers to Collegial Evaluation

In the pilot test and workshops teachers and principals found many ways to handle their lack of time and experience and to minimize the effect of norms and beliefs opposed to evaluation. Some of these successful strategies for overcoming the barriers to collegial evaluation are summarized below to show that the battle can be won.

Time. Teachers who participated in the pilot test used several techniques to free time for observation. In open-space schools, where teachers were teamed in groups of three or more, one teacher freed another by supervising additional students in individualized instruction or by presenting a large group lesson. Even in schools with self-contained classrooms, teachers were willing to help out by taking on another class for one period, particularly if they too were participating in collegial evaluation. The favor of freeing a colleague for observation was returned.

Principals were also cooperative. Especially in the elementary schools, they were willing to teach and thereby free teachers for observing. (And they reported that covering a teacher's class provided them a good excuse to spend more time with the children.) They also arranged for substitute teachers and regular support personnel, such as counselors and specialists, to take over classes. If all the teachers in one school can fit their observation periods into a few days, one substitute can take over classes for five or six observation periods per day. This is a very economical use of the substitute's salary and can probably be justified to school boards as an inexpensive item on their in-service training budget.

Experience. Although some teachers initially felt that their inexperience in evaluating was a problem, this fear was quickly forgotten by most. After the first conference in the pilot test, teachers reported that their partners gave them useful and insightful feedback on their teaching. Many said it was the best they had ever received. The tact and diplomacy exhibited at these conferences were impressive. Most teachers were successful in being critical without being excessively negative. Of course, the fact that teachers gave one another many practical suggestions for improvement did most to overcome the lack of confidence. When teachers saw their own and their partner's teaching improve, their confidence as evaluators soared.

Obtaining agreement on criteria before observations and conferences contributes to such constructive evaluation. Teachers have had little experience in developing common standards. Lack of agreement on criteria for good teaching is common. Many evaluations are made by the principal on the basis of idiosyncratic standards. This often produces disagreements and conflict over evaluations. In collegial evaluation, disagreements on criteria are resolved _before_ the evaluation takes place. Initially, teachers must agree on a list of criteria which will serve as the guidelines for their mutual observations. Given the sorry state of the literature on teaching effectiveness and the multitude of contradictory findings on what constitutes "good teaching," it is doubtful that teachers (or administrators) will ever wholly agree on evaluation criteria. However, it _is_ possible, as teachers in the pilot test demonstrated, for two teachers to agree on about five specific and observable criteria on which to focus their observations, feedback, and plan for improvement.

Beliefs and norms. The closed classroom door is a graphic symbol of the attitudes of some teachers. While this attitude is common, it is also true that many teachers want more adult interaction and welcome opportunities to talk shop. Our research compared teaching teams in open space with teachers in self-contained classrooms. We found that teachers in teams, who had some experience in informally observing one another and exchanging feedback, were much more likely to see other teachers as legitimate evaluators than were teachers behind closed doors. The problem, then, is to open that door to a colleague for the first time. Once it has been opened, chances are it will be opened with gratitude again.

Teachers know that the pressure for accountability means that they will be evaluated more frequently and more thoroughly today and tomorrow than in the past; someone will be observing their classrooms more than once or twice a year. The question is no longer "Should I be observed?" but "Who will observe me?" We think that teachers prefer being observed by one another to being observed by administrators or outsiders. Teachers believe that they can learn more from a respected colleague who faces similar students every day. The accounts of teachers in the pilot test support this belief. These teachers found sustained and focused interaction with colleagues to be a refreshing and stimulating departure from the isolation of the self-contained classroom.

Overcoming resistance to evaluation by students is similar to overcoming resistance to collegial evaluation. Trying it once will make most teachers willing to try it again. In the pilot test of our program, teachers found that responses to student questionnaires provided information they did not and could not receive elsewhere. Student opinions, examined in a context of self-assessment and collegial assessment, helped them see a more complete picture of themselves and their students.

Most teachers, like most other people, probably have two responses to evaluation. One is to want to let well enough alone, arguing that "No one--not colleagues, students, or administrators--knows enough about my work to assess it," or "Teachers are born, not made--it's personality, not training or experience that counts." The other response is to seize any opportunity that will help us become better at tasks that matter to us. In our pilot test, the Collegial Evaluation Program--designed specifically to improve teaching--helped most teachers bring out the best in one another.

Moving Toward Collegial Evaluation

Collegial evaluation is not a panacea; it is a tool. Participating in the program will not always be easy because of problems that are imbedded in the structure and culture of schools. Our program is based on the premise that teachers care about their teaching. Proper evaluation, we believe, can be one of the most powerful methods for improving teaching. As the demand for accountability brings outside pressures for schools to implement new and more rigorous systems of evaluation, teachers can use this opportunity to seize the initiative and overcome many of the obstacles that currently lie between them and collegial evaluation. The collegial process can help teachers move toward a professional view of themselves and their fellow teachers.

The entire collegial process is laid out in sections of this manual, including step-by-step directions, forms, and questionnaires, with tips from teachers who participated in the pilot test. Implementing the program is accomplished by moving through the steps sequentially and tailoring each step to fit your needs.

Section I, "Getting Started: Choosing a Partner," provides a structure for getting started, including a meeting of interested faculty and administrators for the purpose of discussing the pros and cons of using collegial evaluation in your school, how to decide who will participate, and strategies for selecting partners.

Section II, "Student Evaluation." A sample questionnaire is included for obtaining student feedback. Specific directions are provided for interpreting and summarizing the student assessments.

Section III, "Selecting Criteria," outlines a process for choosing criteria, including suggestions for identifying a pool of possible criteria, how to develop a shared list of criteria, and how to check criteria to make sure that they are specific and observable.

Section IV, "Self-Evaluation," describes how to assess your own teaching and compare your assessment with that of your students.

Section V, "Observations and Conferences," provides specific directions for preparing to observe, making the first observations in the classroom, the format of the first conference to exchange evaluations, and suggestions for conducting the second observations and conference. Forms are provided for both the observations and the conferences.

Section VI, "A Plan for Professional Development," tells how to integrate information and turn it into strategies for improvement. Included are the three phases of the final conference: pre-conference activities, the final conference, and post-conference activities.

Section VII, "Adapting Collegial Evaluation for Teacher Trainees," shows how to adapt the program to assist in teacher-training programs.

SECTION I

GETTING STARTED: CHOOSING A PARTNER

Attendance at the first meeting of the program depends on how widespread the interest in collegial evaluation is in your school. At least two teachers are necessary. Everyone who wants to participate in the collegial process or who thinks he or she might want to participate, should attend the first meeting of the program--possibly a schoolwide meeting. The meeting should consist of four activities:

1. Discussing the pros and cons of collegial evaluation in your school.
2. Deciding, individually and as a group, whether to participate in the collegial process.
3. Deciding how to establish collegial pairs, or partners.
4. Selecting or assigning partners.

Discussing the Pros and Cons of Collegial Evaluation

Reading this manual no doubt will have raised questions about how the collegial process might work in your school. For example, you may be concerned about your ability to observe another teacher or feel uncomfortable about having a colleague observe your classroom. Or you may be worried about whether your principal will be supportive. Will your colleague's observations be used by the principal in your formal evaluation? These issues should be discussed at the general meeting. It is important that matters specific to collegial evaluation in your school be discussed at this meeting. Whether the meeting involves the entire faculty, your department, your team, a few members of other departments, or just one other teacher, the discussion should clear the air and give each teacher an opportunity to decide whether the collegial process is worthwhile for him or her.

We suggest the following guidelines for the discussions:

1. Select one person to serve as leader or moderator of the meeting. This person can be a teacher, a team leader, a department head, or the principal.

2. List pros and cons on the blackboard. Beginning with the pro side, the leader should solicit reasons why collegial evaluation would be a possible and desirable means of professional development in your school. These reasons should not be discussed yet.

3. Next, the leader should ask for specific barriers to collegial evaluation, reasons why the process would not be a possible or desirable method for teachers in your school to use to improve professionally. These reasons should also be written on the blackboard without discussion.

4. Which "pros" and which "cons" are really important? Now is the time for a brief assessment. One technique is for the leader to ask each person present to sum up his or her view of the positive and negative sides of collegial evaluation as a means of improving teaching.

Deciding Who Will Participate

The entire faculty's participation in the collegial process is desirable, but if, after discussion, a team, a department, or just an interested group of teachers is in favor of collegial evaluation, that constitutes the participating unit. Once again, two teachers are all that are strictly necessary. We suggest that a short coffee break follow the discussion of pros and cons and that afterward only those who definitely want to participate reconvene. As long as at least two teachers return, the collegial approach to professional development can begin in your school.

In schools where the principal or several teachers want to have the entire faculty participate, it may be better to take a formal vote after discussion. A majority can commit the entire faculty to the collegial process or, if consensus is required to commit the faculty, just those who vote "yes" can become the participating unit.

Selecting or Assigning Partners

The last task of the general meeting is to pair the participating teachers. Each teacher will have a partner with whom to share the entire sequence of activities that make up the Collegial Evaluation Program. There are several ways that the selection can be done. The principal or team leader can assign teachers to pairs, teachers can choose their own partners, or pairs may be assigned randomly, say by drawing names (two at a time) from a hat.

There are advantages and disadvantages to each method. If principals, department heads, or team leaders assign partners, they can try to match teachers with complementary strengths, maximizing the opportunity for teachers to learn from one another in the areas where they need most improvement. However, if the partnerships are assigned, teachers may resent not being consulted or may feel that one partner will be labeled a "strong" or "good" teacher, while the other will be labeled a "weak" or "poor" teacher.

Most of the teachers in the pilot test said they would prefer to choose their own partners. They said they would feel more comfortable being observed by and exchanging constructive criticism with someone of their own choosing. As one teacher said, "Working with a fellow teacher on this program requires a lot of respect and trust. You've got to really like one another. It's almost like a marriage. Only if you like someone can you be honest." Some teachers, however, expressed reservations about selecting their own partners. They were not convinced that it would be easy to receive criticism from a friend, and to give it in return. These teachers said that they might not be critical enough with a friend for fear of damaging the relationship.

If teachers select their own partners, they should choose someone they respect professionally. Teachers in the pilot test agreed that mutual respect was more important than similar educational philosophies, subject areas, or grade levels, although these factors were also regarded as important. In the pilot test there was no difference in the quality of feedback or mutual respect between partners with comparable experience and partners with immensely different years of teaching service. From this, we might conclude that extent of teaching experience may not need to be considered in selecting a partner.

Should the decision be to select your own partner, the following suggestions from teachers who have completed the program will be helpful:

1. Choose a partner whose teaching competencies you respect.
2. Choose a partner who shares an educational philosophy similar to your own.
3. Choose a partner with whom you can be honest.
4. If you don't know whom to choose, observe a few potential partners in their classrooms before agreeing to work with one of them.

An advantage of assigning collegial pairs randomly is that there should be no hurt feelings, since no teacher will be left out. Because strong cliques or social patterns will not be reinforced by random assignment, partners may be able to give each other more constructive criticism. The disadvantages include the possibility that the partners may not respect one another, may not share similar philosophies, or may not be personally compatible. If your faculty believes that the advantages of random selection outweigh the disadvantages, then the decision to randomly assign pairs may be the wise course. Random assignment can be done with an entire faculty, within a subject area or grade level (e.g., the math department or the primary grades), or even within a large team that teaches together in the same instructional space. Have someone draw pairs of names from a hat and, if it seems desirable, make a list of the pairs.

cut here

FIELD TEST QUESTIONNAIRE NUMBER 1

Please take a few minutes to fill out this questionnaire as soon as you have chosen your partner. Of necessity, this initial questionnaire is nearly twice as long as later questionnaires. This is due to our need for background information on you and your partner.

Background Information

1. Teacher's Name ______________________________
2. Sex __________________
3. Age __________________
4. Number of years of teaching experience __________________
5. Number of years of teaching experience in this district ________
6. Number of years of teaching experience in this school __________
7. Highest academic training completed __________________________
8. Indicate here the grade level or subject field you currently teach. ____
9. How frequently was your classroom teaching observed by your principal last year?
10. How frequently was your classroom teaching observed by other teachers last year?

Choosing a Partner

11. Your partner's name ___________________________________
12. In the selection of your partner, which of the following were significant factors? (Check as many as apply)
    - (a) Luck of the draw, only one person left
    - (b) Random assignment
    - (c) Assignment by an administrator
    - (d) Assignment by another person
    - (e) Friendship
    - (f) Similar background or experience in teaching

(continued)

cut here

Teacher's Name ______________________

(g) Seeking different background or experience in teaching
(h) Similar philosophy of education
(i) Seeking different philosophy of education
(j) Similar subject fields
(k) Seeking different subject fields
(l) Similar skills in teaching
(m) Seeking different skills in teaching

13. Compared to your own image of an excellent teacher, how good do you consider your own teaching performance?

Extremely good	Very good	Moderately good	Slightly good	Not at all good

14. How confident are you that the Collegial Evaluation Program will help you improve your teaching?

Extremely confident	Very confident	Moderately confident	Slightly confident	Not at all confident

15. How helpful have past formal evaluations been in improving your teaching?

Extremely helpful	Very helpful	Moderately helpful	Slightly helpful	Not at all helpful

16. How helpful have past informal evaluations by other teachers been in improving your teaching?

Extremely helpful	Very helpful	Moderately helpful	Slightly helpful	Not at all helpful

17. How anxious have you felt during past formal evaluations of your teaching?

Extremely anxious	Very anxious	Moderately anxious	Slightly anxious	Not at all anxious

18. How soundly based were the past formal evaluations of your teaching?

Extremely soundly	Very soundly	Moderately soundly	Slightly soundly	Not at all soundly

19. In general, how often do you informally talk with other teachers about ways of improving teaching?

Never	Few times a year	About once a month	Once a week	Several times a week

20. How similar is your philosophy of teaching to that of your partner?

Extremely similar	Very similar	Moderately similar	Slightly similar	Not at all similar	Don't know

cut here

Teacher's Name ____________________________

21. How friendly do you feel toward your partner?

Extremely friendly	Very friendly	Moderately friendly	Slightly friendly	Not at all friendly

22. How anxious do you feel about having your teaching observed by your partner?

Extremely anxious	Very anxious	Moderately anxious	Slightly anxious	Not at all anxious

23. How confident are you that your partner's observations of your teaching will be soundly based?

Extremely confident	Very confident	Moderately confident	Slightly confident	Not at all confident

24. How satisfied are you with your partner so far?

Extremely satisfied	Very satisfied	Moderately satisfied	Slightly satisfied	Not at all satisfied

25. How well has the manual explained the steps which you have completed so far?

Extremely well	Very well	Moderately well	Slightly well	Not at all well

26. What have been the most positive aspects of your experience with the Collegial Evaluation Program so far?

27. What have been the most negative aspects of your experience with the Collegial Evaluation Program so far?

28. How could the Collegial Evaluation Program be improved?

SECTION II

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

Because students are your clients, not your professional colleagues, there are some areas of teaching performance for which their opinions can provide little guidance. But there is some important information that can be obtained only from your students. They are the persons for whose benefit you teach. They are also the persons to whom your teaching performance is most visible. No observer, your fellow teachers included, can accurately determine the students' point of view concerning your teaching. Nor can a single observer give you the perspective that twenty students in a class can provide. In assessing student feedback, one teacher said:

> I believe that the student questionnaire was extremely valuable in providing information that I myself or a third person could not possibly provide adequately or accurately. The specific kinds of questions deal with problems that cannot be readily observed. They focus on those student personal and academic needs that are basic to learning.

Especially when added to your colleague's evaluations, students' evaluations of your teaching performance can be extremely helpful.

You will have to reproduce enough copies of the Student Questionnaire so that there is one for each of your students. We provide a Data Record form for you and your partner.

The topics covered by the Student Questionnaire range from the students' attitudes toward teaching and learning to their perception of the general atmosphere in the class. You may use these questions or develop new ones appropriate for the grade level of your students and the aspects of your teaching or classroom you consider important. The questionnaire was designed to ascertain general attitudes that would be informative to teachers regardless of their subject areas. It was not intended as a definitive and complete survey of student opinion. You may wish to add other items or revise the ones we have included. No doubt there are many student attitudes and opinions of great interest to you which are not measured by items in the questionnaire. Do add them. (Be sure to add parallel questions to Part A of the teacher Self-Assessment Form that goes with Section IV.)

In particular, adding questions relating to the grade level or subject area you teach will greatly supplement the information you can gain from your students. For example, in the pilot test a music teacher developed a number of questions relating to his skills as a choir director. He learned that his conducting was "fairly easy to follow," but almost half of the students felt he "stayed on one piece of music too long"; most of the choir members thought the music was "OK," with just a few liking it "a lot" or "not much"; and two students thought that he "looked like a madman" when conducting.

Obviously, very young students or students with reading problems cannot do the questionnaire, but teachers often have read questions aloud to their students or found more informal ways to get feedback.

In order to get students to answer questions as honestly as possible, it is important to stress that:

1. They are not to sign the questionnaire.
2. They are to answer by circling the appropriate number and are not to provide any clue, such as handwriting, that would enable you to know who answered any particular questionnaire.

3. You really want to know their honest opinions. It is to their advantage as well as yours that you be given an accurate basis for improving your teaching.

Computing the mean or average response to each question is easy. Just tally the number of students giving each response to a question, and multiply the value of each response (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5) by the tallied number. Add together the five products and divide that sum by the number of students answering. The result is the mean response of the students. Later you can compare this result with your own Self-Assessment Form and the evaluation of your colleague. In analyzing the class response on the questionnaire, you will also want to look at the distribution of the responses--that is the number of students giving each response.

Neither the mean response nor the distribution can be ignored when interpreting responses to a question. Many times in the pilot test the two told very different stories. For example, one teacher found that the average response to the question "How difficult or easy is the work you have to do in this class?" was "somewhat difficult." Her first reaction to this response was to lower her expectations and assign easier work. By looking at the distribution of responses, however, she saw that a quarter of her students thought the work was "just right" or "somewhat easy." Instead of assigning easier work to the entire class, she decided to develop materials and lessons tailored to the diversity of her students.

It is also useful to examine the answers to different questions in relation to one another. One teacher in the pilot test learned that her students were "usually" confused about what's going on. Most of these students also said they were "seldom" encouraged to ask questions when they did not understand what was going on and that the teacher's directions were only "slightly" clear. This teacher concluded that the combination of unclear directions and lack of encouragement to ask questions explained, at least in part, why the students were often confused.

Careful analysis of the student questionnaire should help you in three ways.

1. The problems students perceive should help you develop specific criteria to guide your colleague's observation (Section III).
2. Finding out what aspects of your behavior or the classroom environment your students feel need improvement should help you formulate your improvement plan (Section VI).
3. The overall picture of your teaching provided by student responses should give you insights into your performance as a teacher and the climate of your classroom.

Teachers who have used the student questionnaire recommend the following procedures:

1. Administer the student questionnaire before you select criteria, because it may give you ideas of areas that should be observed.
2. Be sure to guarantee anonymity to students.
3. Pay attention to the distribution of responses as well as to the average response on each item of the questionnaire.
4. Later, in your first conference, discuss any discrepancies between the Self-Assessment Form and the Student Questionnaire with your colleague.

cut here

Teacher's Name ____________________

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Almost every teacher wants to improve his or her teaching. I need your help. I really want to know your honest opinions.

Don't sign the questionnaire and just circle the appropriate numbers. That way there won't be any clue, such as handwriting, that would enable me to know who filled out any particular questionnaire.

It's to my advantage, and yours, that you give me an accurate basis for improving my teaching.

1. How enjoyable to you is the course work in this class?

Extremely Enjoyable	Very Enjoyable	Moderately Enjoyable	Slightly Enjoyable	Not at All Enjoyable
1	2	3	4	5

2. How often do you feel so confused about what's going on in this class that you don't see any reason to try?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

3. We all have problems with our schoolwork sometimes. When you have a problem with your work in this class, how hard does the teacher try to help you?

Extremely Hard	Very Hard	Moderately Hard	Slightly Hard	Not at All Hard
1	2	3	4	5

4. How patient is the teacher when students are having problems learning?

Extremely Patient	Very Patient	Moderately Patient	Slightly Patient	Not at All Patient
1	2	3	4	5

5. How interested in you as a person is the teacher?

Extremely Interested	Very Interested	Moderately Interested	Slightly Interested	Not at All Interested
1	2	3	4	5

6. How friendly to you is the teacher?

Extremely Friendly	Very Friendly	Moderately Friendly	Slightly Friendly	Not at All Friendly
1	2	3	4	5

cut here

Teacher's Name ______________________________

7. How good is the teacher's sense of humor?

Extremely Good	Very Good	Moderately Good	Slightly Good	Not at All Good
1	2	3	4	5

8. When you don't understand what's going on in this class, how often are you encouraged to ask questions?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

9. When you have a personal problem related to school, how often does the teacher help you?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

10. How difficult or easy is the work you have to do in this class?

Much too Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Just Right	Somewhat Easy	Much too Easy
1	2	3	4	5

11. How often does the teacher try to figure out what work will be just right for you?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

12. When you have work to do, how often are you free to choose the way you do the work?

Always	Usually	Fairly often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

13. How often does the teacher let you know you are doing good work?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

14. How important is it to you that the teacher like you?

Extremely Important	Very Important	Moderately Important	Slightly Important	Not at All Important
1	2	3	4	5

15. If you wanted to talk to the teacher outside of class time, how often is the teacher available?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

cut here

Teacher's Name ____________________

16. How often do you talk with the teacher outside of class time?

Very Frequently	Frequently	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

17. How orderly are the students during the class?

Extremely Orderly	Very Orderly	Moderately Orderly	Slightly Orderly	Not at All Orderly
1	2	3	4	5

18. We all do poor work sometimes. When you do poor work in this class, how often do you get poor grades?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

19. We all do good work sometimes. When you do good work in this class, how often do you get good grades?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

20. Suppose you worked hard in this class, how often would you get good grades?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

21. Suppose you didn't work hard, how often would you get poor grades?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

22. How often does the teacher favor certain students in the class?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

23. How often do you really pay attention to the class work?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

24. How well does the teacher know the subject being taught?

Extremely Well	Very Well	Moderately Well	Slightly Well	Not at All Well
1	2	3	4	5

25. How clear to you are the teacher's explanations of the class work?

Extremely Clear	Very Clear	Moderately Clear	Slightly Clear	Not at All Clear
1	2	3	4	5

Teacher's Name ______________________________

26. How interested are you in the material covered in this class?

Extremely Interested	Very Interested	Moderately Interested	Slightly Interested	Not at All Interested
1	2	3	4	5

27. How important to you is learning the material in this class?

Extremely Important	Very Important	Moderately Important	Slightly Important	Not at All Important
1	2	3	4	5

cut here

cut here

Teacher's Name ______________________ Copy for you - page 1

DATA RECORD FOR STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

On this form, convert responses on the Student Questionnaires to class averages by following these steps:

(1) Record each student's response to each question with a tick mark on the appropriate line of the tally column (e.g. ~~1111~~).

(2) Add the tally marks on each line and enter the total in the number or "frequency," column.

(3) Multiply the numbers in the number column by the value in the scale column, and enter the product in the product column.

(4) For each question, add up the products and divide the sum by the total number of students who responded to that question. Record the resultant mean (average) in the box.

(5) Record these data in the appropriate spaces of the Data Records for your partner, and for the field test research team.

1. student enjoys?	tally	number	scale	product
extremely			1	
very			2	
moderately			3	
slightly			4	
not at all			5	
Average				

2. student confused?

always			1	
usually			2	
fairly often			3	
seldom			4	
never			5	
Average				

3. teacher effort?

extremely			1	
very			2	
moderately			3	
slightly			4	
not at all			5	
Average				

4. teacher patient?	tally	number	scale	product
extremely			1	
very			2	
moderately			3	
slightly			4	
not at all			5	
Average				

5. interested in you?

extremely			1	
very			2	
moderately			3	
slightly			4	
not at all			5	
Average				

6. friendly to you?

extremely			1	
very			2	
moderately			3	
slightly			4	
not at all			5	
Average				

Teacher's Name ______________________________ Copy for you - page 2

cut here

7. good sense of humor?

	tally	number	scale	product
extremely			1	
very			2	
moderately			3	
slightly			4	
not at all			5	
Average				

8. encourages questions?

	tally	number	scale	product
always			1	
usually			2	
fairly often			3	
seldom			4	
never			5	
Average				

9. personal problem help?

	tally	number	scale	product
always			1	
usually			2	
fairly often			3	
seldom			4	
never			5	
Average				

10. difficulty of work

	tally	number	scale	product
very hard			1	
somewhat hard			2	
just right			3	
somewhat easy			4	
very easy			5	
Average				

11. "just right" assignments?

	tally	number	scale	product
always			1	
usually			2	
fairly often			3	
seldom			4	
never			5	
Average				

12. choose own way?

	tally	number	scale	product
always			1	
usually			2	
fairly often			3	
seldom			4	
never			5	
Average				

13. tells of good work?

	tally	number	scale	product
always			1	
usually			2	
fairly oft			3	
seldom			4	
never			5	
Average				

14. important to be liked?

	tally	number	scale	product
extremely			1	
very			2	
moderately			3	
slightly			4	
not at all			5	
Average				

15. available outside class?

	tally	number	scale	product
always			1	
usually			2	
fairly oft			3	
seldom			4	
never			5	
Average				

16. talk outside class?

	tally	number	scale	product
very freq.			1	
frequent			2	
often			3	
seldom			4	
very easy			5	
Average				

17. students orderly?

	tally	number	scale	product
extremely			1	
very			2	
moderately			3	
slightly			4	
not at all			5	
Average				

18. poor grade for poor work?

	tally	number	scale	product
always			1	
usually			2	
fairly oft			3	
seldom			4	
never			5	
Average				

Teacher's Name ______________________________ Copy for you - page 3

cut here

19. good grades for good work?

	tally	number	scale	product
always			1	
usually			2	
fairly often			3	
seldom			4	
never			5	
Average				

20. good grades for hard work?

	tally	number	scale	product
always			1	
usually			2	
fairly often			3	
seldom			4	
never			5	
Average				

21. poor grades if lazy?

	tally	number	scale	product
always			1	
usually			2	
fairly often			3	
seldom			4	
never			5	
Average				

22. teacher favorites?

	tally	number	scale	product
always			1	
usually			2	
fairly often			3	
seldom			4	
never			5	
Average				

23. student's attention?

	tally	number	scale	product
always			1	
usually			2	
fairly often			3	
seldom			4	
never			5	
Average				

24. teacher knowledge?

	tally	number	scale	product
extremely			1	
very			2	
moderately			3	
slightly			4	
not at all			5	
Average				

25. clear explanations?

	tally	number	scale	product
extremely			1	
very			2	
moderately			3	
slightly			4	
not at all			5	
Average				

26. interested in material?

	tally	number	scale	product
extremely			1	
very			2	
moderately			3	
slightly			4	
not at all			5	
Average				

27. important material?

	tally	number	scale	product
extremely			1	
very			2	
moderately			3	
slightly			4	
not at all			5	
Average				

cut here

Teacher's Name ______________________ Copy for your partner-page 1

DATA RECORD FOR STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. student enjoys?	number	scale	product
extremely		1	
very		2	
moderately		3	
slightly		4	
not at all		5	
Average			

2. student confused?

always		1	
usually		2	
fairly often		3	
seldom		4	
never		5	
Average			

3. teacher effort?

extremely		1	
very		2	
moderately		3	
slightly		4	
not at all		5	
Average			

4. teacher patient?

extremely		1	
very		2	
moderately		3	
slightly		4	
not at all		5	
Average			

5. interested in you?

extremely		1	
very		2	
moderately		3	
slightly		4	
not at all		5	
Average			

6. friendly to you?	number	scale	product
extremely		1	
very		2	
moderately		3	
slightly		4	
not at all		5	
Average			

7. good sense of humor?

extremely		1	
very		2	
moderately		3	
slightly		4	
not at all		5	
Average			

8. encourages questions?

always		1	
usually		2	
fairly often		3	
seldom		4	
never		5	
Average			

9. personal problem help?

always		1	
usually		2	
fairly often		3	
seldom		4	
never		5	
Average			

10. difficulty of work

very hard		1	
somewhat hard		2	
just right		3	
somewhat easy		4	
very easy		5	
Average			

Teacher's Name ____________________ Copy for your partner-page 2

cut here

11. "just right" assignments?

	number	scale	product
always		1	
usually		2	
fairly often		3	
seldom		4	
never		5	
Average			

12. choose own way?

always		1	
usually		2	
fairly often		3	
seldom		4	
never		5	
Average			

13. tells of good work?

always		1	
usually		2	
fairly often		3	
seldom		4	
never		5	
Average			

14. important to be liked?

extremely		1	
very		2	
moderately		3	
slightly		4	
not at all		5	
Average			

15. available outside class?

always		1	
usually		2	
fairly often		3	
seldom		4	
never		5	
Average			

16. talk outside class?

very frequent		1	
frequent		2	
often		3	
seldom		4	
never		5	
Average			

17. students orderly?

	number	scale	product
extremely		1	
very		2	
moderately		3	
slightly		4	
not at all		5	
Average			

18. poor grade for poor work?

always		1	
usually		2	
fairly often		3	
seldom		4	
never		5	
Average			

19. good grades for good work?

always		1	
usually		2	
fairly often		3	
seldom		4	
never		5	
Average			

20. good grades for hard work?

always		1	
usually		2	
fairly often		3	
seldom		4	
never		5	
Average			

21. poor grades if lazy?

always		1	
usually		2	
fairly often		3	
seldom		4	
never		5	
Average			

22. teacher favorites?

always		1	
usually		2	
fairly often		3	
seldom		4	
never		5	
Average			

Teacher's Name ____________________ Copy for your partner-page 3

23. student's attention?

	number	scale	product
always		1	
usually		2	
fairly often		3	
seldom		4	
never			
Average			

24. teacher knowledge?

extremely		1	
very		2	
moderately		3	
slightly		4	
not at all		5	
Average			

25. clear explanations?

extremely		1	
very		2	
moderately		3	
slightly		4	
not at all		5	
Average			

26. interested in material

extremely		1	
very		2	
moderately		3	
slightly		4	
not at all		5	
Average			

27. important material?

extremely		1	
very		2	
moderately		3	
slightly		4	
not at all		5	
Average			

cut here

Teacher's Name ____________________ **Copy for field test team-page 1**

cut here

DATA RECORD FOR STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. student enjoys?

	number	scale	product
extremely		1	
very		2	
moderately		3	
slightly		4	
not at all		5	
Average			☐

2. student confused?

	number	scale	product
always		1	
usually		2	
fairly often		3	
seldom		4	
never		5	
Average			☐

3. teacher effort?

	number	scale	product
extremely		1	
very		2	
moderately		3	
slightly		4	
not at all		5	
Average			☐

4. teacher patient?

	number	scale	product
extremely		1	
very		2	
moderately		3	
slightly		4	
not at all		5	
Average			☐

5. interested in you?

	number	scale	product
extremely		1	
very		2	
moderately		3	
slightly		4	
not at all		5	
Average			☐

6. friendly to you?

	number	scale	product
extremely		1	
very		2	
moderately		3	
slightly		4	
not at all		5	
Average			☐

7. good sense of humor?

	number	scale	product
extremely		1	
very		2	
moderately		3	
slightly		4	
not at all		5	
Average			☐

8. encourages questions?

	number	scale	product
always		1	
usually		2	
fairly often		3	
seldom		4	
never		5	
Average			☐

9. personal problem help?

	number	scale	product
always		1	
usually		2	
fairly often		3	
seldom		4	
never		5	
Average			☐

10. difficulty of work

	number	scale	product
very hard		1	
somewhat hard		2	
just right		3	
somewhat easy		4	
very easy		5	
Average			☐

Teacher's Name ______________________ **Copy for field test team-page 2**

cut here

11. "just right" assignments?

	number	scale	product
always		1	
usually		2	
fairly often		3	
seldom		4	
never		5	
Average			

12. choose own way?

always		1	
usually		2	
fairly often		3	
seldom		4	
never		5	
Average			

13. tells of good work?

always		1	
usually		2	
fairly often		3	
seldom		4	
never		5	
Average			

14. important to be liked?

extremely		1	
very		2	
moderately		3	
slightly		4	
not at all		5	
Average			

15. available outside class?

always		1	
usually		2	
fairly often		3	
seldom		4	
never		5	
Average			

16. talk outside class?

very frequent		1	
frequent		2	
often		3	
seldom		4	
never		5	
Average			

17. students orderly?

	number	scale	product
extremely		1	
very		2	
moderately		3	
slightly		4	
not at all		5	
Average			

18. poor grade for poor work?

always		1	
usually		2	
fairly often		3	
seldom		4	
never		5	
Average			

19. good grades for good work?

always		1	
usually		2	
fairly often		3	
seldom		4	
never		5	
Average			

20. good grades for hard work?

always		1	
usually		2	
fairly often		3	
seldom		4	
never		5	
Average			

21. poor grades if lazy?

always		1	
usually		2	
fairly often		3	
seldom		4	
never		5	
Average			

22. teacher favorites?

always		1	
usually		2	
fairly often		3	
seldom		4	
never		5	
Average			

Teacher's Name ______________________ **Copy for field test team-page 3**

cut here

23. student's attention?

	number	scale	product
always		1	
usually		2	
fairly often		3	
seldom		4	
never			
Average			

24. teacher knowledge?

extremely		1	
very		2	
moderately		3	
slightly		4	
not at all		5	
Average			

25. clear explanations?

extremely		1	
very		2	
moderately		3	
slightly		4	
not at all		5	
Average			

26. interested in material

extremely		1	
very		2	
moderately		3	
slightly		4	
not at all		5	
Average			

27. important material?

extremely		1	
very		2	
moderately		3	
slightly		4	
not at all		5	
Average			

FIELD TEST QUESTIONNAIRE NUMBER 2

Student Assessment

1. Name ________________________________

2. How confident are you that the student evaluations were soundly based?

Extremely Confident	Very Confident	Moderately Confident	Slightly Confident	Not at All Confident

3. How anxious did you feel about having the students fill out a questionnaire on your teaching performance?

Extremely Anxious	Very Anxious	Moderately Anxious	Slightly Anxious	Not at All Anxious

4. In general, how close were your own self-ratings to the average student responses?

Extremely Close	Very Close	Moderately Close	Slightly Close	Not at All Close

5. How useful were the student evaluations in pointing out areas of your teaching that you would like to improve?

Extremely Useful	Very Useful	Moderately Useful	Slightly Useful	Not at All Useful

6. How confident are you that the Collegial Evaluation Program will help you improve your teaching?

Extremely Confident	Very Confident	Moderately Confident	Slightly Confident	Not at All Confident

7. How well has the manual explained the steps which you have had to complete so far?

Extremely Well	Very Well	Moderately Well	Slightly Well	Not at All Well

8. What have been the most positive aspects of your experience with the Collegial Evaluation Program so far?

9. What have been the most negative aspects of your experience with the Collegial Evaluation Program so far?

10. How could the Collegial Evaluation Program be improved?

cut here

SECTION III

SELECTING CRITERIA

Selecting the criteria to guide your reciprocal observations is difficult. We believe, however, that it can be accomplished and that the consistent, accurate observations that will be the result make the effort spent worthwhile. We specify a process with five steps: (1) identifying a pool of possible criteria (see below), (2) selecting criteria independently, (3) agreeing on criteria, jointly or collectively, (4) checking agreed-upon criteria for specificity and observability, and (5) listing shared criteria on the forms provided in the manual for observations and self-evaluation.

Sources

What specific sources can be used for developing these criteria? Obvious ones are the philosophy and experience of you and your teaching colleagues. Different educational goals produce different images of effective teaching. Consequently, criteria must be developed that are compatible with each teacher's conception of desirable teaching practices. Teachers in the pilot test reported that the process of selecting criteria forced them to clarify their educational philosophy--that is, to reflect on what was important to them and what they, as teachers, were trying to accomplish. Once this was done, it was easier to think of areas where improvement was needed. All teachers found gaps between their ideals and the day-to-day reality of their classrooms that suggested specific criteria. Discussing successful teaching practices also helped generate criteria. Over all, the teachers found their own experiences to be the most useful source of criteria, although they incorporated ideas from other sources as well.

One of these other sources was student questionnaires. Student responses to the questionnaire in Section II may indicate where your teaching performance or the classroom environment needs improvement. For example, one teacher learned that the majority of her pupils felt that her directions were unclear. Thus, "clarity of directions" became her first criterion.

Another source of criteria is district or school goals and philosophy. Districts and schools that have been required to be accountable for the performance of their students have developed written philosophies, goals, and objectives, which, though often vague or focused on learning outcomes, are still a resource to be mined for criteria.

Books and articles, whether on philosophies of teaching or specific teaching methods, are a fourth source of criteria. You might, for example, look at William Glasser's Schools Without Failure, Madeline Hunter's five-part series, Teach More Faster, Retention, Reinforcement, Teach for Transfer, and Motivation; or Dewey's Experience and Education.

Recent research linking specific teacher behaviors, or skills, to learning outcomes is a fifth source from which criteria can be developed. This research is still in its infancy and has not yet conclusively related aspects of teacher performance to learning outcomes, but it can nevertheless provide a guide to criteria for evaluating teaching.

A sixth source of criteria is the recent legislation setting accountability guidelines. These documents specify areas in which performance should be assessed. More important, if collegial evaluation is intended by the teachers to be linked eventually to the formal evaluation system, developing criteria in areas specified by the formal or legal systems is advisable.

Finally, we present here examples of criteria some teachers have found helpful.

Examples of Criteria

1. Maintains enough control over behavior so that student learning is not interfered with
2. Makes students feel comfortable
3. Communicates enthusiasm and interest
4. Organizes material well
5. Clearly presents material
6. Presentation fits into overall plan for the course
7. Demonstrates knowledge of subject matter
8. Employs a wide variety of techniques and materials
9. Praises good performance by students
10. Praises when students put out effort
11. Criticizes inadequate performance by students
12. Criticizes when students do not put out effort
13. Relates subject matter to experiences of students
14. Keeps order during discussion
15. Keeps discussion on track
16. Encourages generalizations by students
17. Encourages widespread participation in discussion
18. Listens carefully to student questions
19. Incorporates and uses suggestions by students in lesson
20. Accepts student views that are different from teacher's ideas
21. Encourages cooperation among students
22. Encourages students to interact with each other
23. Encourages students to work in groups
24. Encourages students to work independently
25. Encourages students to think independently
26. Encourages students to ask questions when they don't understand material

27. Encourages students to question teacher judgments
28. Encourages students to question views of other students
29. Presents opinions (and identifies them as opinions) as well as facts
30. Makes sure that students understand material (by questioning, probing, discussing, using written exercises)
31. Gives individualized feedback to students on their performances
32. Helps individual students with their academic problems
33. Makes material understandable for weaker students
34. Keeps interest of weaker students
35. Presents material at appropriate level of difficulty for stronger students
36. Keeps interest of stronger students
37. Students appear attentive
38. Student responses and interaction relate to subject
39. Number of students called on for answers to questions
40. Average length of time teacher waits for an answer
41. Avoids distracting speech mannerisms or gestures
42. Links classroom material to subject matter previously covered
43. Links classroom material to subject matter to be covered
44. Is alert to whether students understand material
45. Is patient with students
46. Expresses interest in students
47. Is friendly to students
48. Gives students freedom to make own choices
49. Does not play favorites
50. Shows own interest in material being covered

Meeting to Select Criteria

The second meeting of teachers in the Collegial Evaluation Program is to choose the criteria for evaluation. We have designed three possible agendas: one for two teachers participating alone, one for a team, and one for all or most of a school faculty.

Choosing criteria is easier for two teachers than for an entire faculty, since the greater the number of teachers, the greater the diversity of ideas about good teaching. But whether you select criteria with your partner, a team, or the entire faculty, the heart of the collegial process is your supportive professional relationship with your partner. We believe the proposed agendas will help you agree on criteria in any group, regardless of its size.

Two Teachers

1. Prior to meeting with your partner for the first time, do two things on your own:

(a) make certain that you understand the major points of the collegial process (review the manual),

(b) tentatively select criteria for judging your teaching performance.

The criteria should be specific and observable and should represent your conception of good teaching. Use any of the suggested sources and our list of examples of criteria. Write your tentative criteria on the form provided. Send a copy to your partner.

2. When you and your partner meet, first establish the agenda for the meeting, with some limits on the time you want to devote to discussing each item or point. We suggest the following agenda:

(a) discuss any questions either of you may have about the collegial process,

(b) raise questions concerning your two lists,

(c) jointly select about five criteria, preferably the same criteria for both teachers,

(d) ask whether each criterion is observable and measurable,

(e) enter the final list of criteria for each teacher on the form for observation and self-assessment.

3. If you can, do agree to use the same criteria. All teachers in the pilot test were able to agree on a joint list. They said that it helped save time later, in the conferences, since they were exchanging information about the same items. However, if you cannot agree on as many as five criteria, list those criteria on which you can agree, and create two sublists of the other desired criteria. The shared criteria plus the additional criteria of each teacher become the basis for assessment of that teacher in the classroom.

A Team or Department

1. Prior to the meeting:

   (a) review the manual,

   (b) develop a tentative list of important criteria that are observable and measurable,

   (c) select a temporary team or department leader, if necessary.

2. Prior to the meeting the leader (department chairperson or team leader) should:

   (a) collect a list of tentative criteria from each teacher,

   (b) integrate the criteria into a master list which will include only those types of criteria for which there appears to be interest by two or more teachers,

   (c) distribute the master list and all the individual lists to each teacher.

3. The leader should chair the criteria-selection meeting. The first task is to set the agenda, with a time limit for discussing each topic. We suggest the following agenda items:

   (a) Answer questions about the collegial process.

   (b) Briefly discuss the criteria on the master list. Make sure that most teachers really agree on these criteria. Then list them on the board as common criteria to be used by all teachers.

   (c) Discuss the remaining criteria. Attempt to arrive at a consensus. If there is no consensus, and if there are subgroups of partners who agree, make separate lists of criteria for those groups having consensus. (Make certain that all criteria are observable and measurable and that each pair of teachers has about five criteria.)

(d) Ask each teacher to enter the final list of criteria on the forms for observation and self-assessment of his or her teaching.

A Faculty

1. Prior to the meeting all participating teachers should:

   (a) review the manual,

   (b) develop a tentative list of important criteria that are observable and measurable,

   (c) select a temporary leader.

2. Prior to the meeting the principal or temporary leader should:

   (a) invite (perhaps by memo) each participating teacher to discuss the collegial process with the leader before the meeting,

   (b) collect a list of tentative criteria from each teacher,

   (c) draw up a tentative master list of criteria that were often suggested,

   (d) make a list of the remaining criteria,

   (e) distribute both lists to the faculty before the meeting,

   (f) if there is enormous disagreement on the criteria for good teaching, appoint a temporary committee of two teachers to represent diverse positions and seek to build a high-consensus list that overcomes superficial differences and distribute this list before the meeting.

3. The meeting to develop criteria involving the faculty should not be held after a regular school day or during a regular faculty meeting. Tired, harassed teachers should not be asked to perform this important task. Holding the meeting at the end of a minimum day is one possibility; a Saturday meeting or a retreat are other possibilities. The principal or temporary faculty leader should chair the meeting. The agenda should be established prior to the meeting and time allotments made for each agenda item. We suggest the following agenda items:

   (a) Review the collegial process and discuss any questions.

(b) Discuss the master list and confirm the general agreement by a show of hands. Retain a criterion if a certain number --say, more than half the teachers--consider it appropriate.

(c) Discuss the low-consensus list. If there is general agreement on any criterion, add it to the master list. If there are subgroups who can agree on a list, have each subgroup make a separate list.

(d) Check the master list and sublists to see that each criterion listed is observable and measurable.

(e) Ask each teacher to enter the final list of criteria on the forms for observation and self-assessment of his or her teaching.

Common Problems in Selecting Criteria

According to the teachers in our pilot test, selecting criteria that would be useful in observations and conferences was by far the most difficult step in the Collegial Evaluation Program. The main problem was finding criteria that were specific enough to observe and still important to the participants. For example, the teachers could easily observe "ability to write clearly on the blackboard," but they were more interested in their rapport with students, or their ability to "motivate" each individual. Rapport and motivation are much more difficult to observe and measure than writing on the blackboard.

Another difficulty was selecting criteria representing aspects of teaching performance that occurred frequently enough to observe without incurring scheduling problems. Some of the criteria centered around the teacher working with one individual or small groups when the lesson observed was large group instruction. Some teachers selected too many criteria. Then as observers they could not see everything at once, and the feedback they were able to offer to one another was less good than it might have been.

Usually, participants were able to agree on the criteria to use in observing one another, and in no case did they opt for completely different criteria. Rather, the major sources of disagreement came in their attempts to define and measure the criteria. Part of the problem lay in the tendency to use vague or ambiguous terms that did not lend themselves to subjective agreement. For example, teachers who selected "uses communication skills effectively," "degree of engagement by students," or "response of class to lesson" later spent much of their conference time trying to decide what they had meant by "communication skills," "response," or "engagement."

Suggestions for Choosing Appropriate Criteria

After the pilot test, the participants recommended that each pair of teachers decide how they planned to measure and observe a criterion before they agreed to use it. They said that it might be profitable to list a number of general goals, such as "better reinforcement of student responses," and then identify two or more indices to measure that goal. The *indices*, rather than the goal, should then be listed as criteria. For example, to measure the goal of "motivating students to participate in a discussion," teachers generated the following measures: "number of times the teacher responded with a positive statement vs. a negative statement to a student comment," "average length of time teacher waited for an answer," "number of students who were called on to answer a question," and "terms teacher used to praise or sanction students." Using these more concrete criteria, the teachers learned about some of their specific behaviors which stirred or hampered student motivation. One teacher learned that the words she used to praise students were over dramatic and her peer felt that students dismissed her praise as unrealistic. She vowed to delete "fantastic" and "terrific" from her vocabulary except in response to *truly* fantastic performance. Another teacher learned that she only called on students seated in the front rows and decided to rotate seating position weekly.

Some of the better criteria were those which were "subject-matter-specific." Two physical education teachers agreed that "physical safety" was an important criterion for a tumbling lesson. One observed that although the other teacher had carefully arranged the tumbling mats, several girls had not tied back their hair and others were chewing gum during the practice session. Two music teachers confined all their criteria to the subject of music and gave each other excellent feedback concerning "time limit per piece," "use of musical terms," "explanation of the warm-up period," "presentation of rehearsal objectives," and "stops made during the rehearsal." In a drama lesson an intern was observed on the "variety and appropriateness of facial and bodily movement to convey the feeling of the play."

Also useful were criteria that referred to specific mannerisms or habits of the teachers. Observing "any distracting speech mannerisms or gestures," a teacher discovered that her peer ended almost every sentence with a tentative "OK?" The teacher was not aware that she had this habit. One of the pairs in an open-space classroom listed "mobility around the pod" as a criterion. They found that one teacher was moving around too often and the other teacher was not moving often enough to supervise students adequately.

Summary

We have summarized the experiences of these teachers in the following suggestions to help you select criteria that are specific, observable, and important indicators of your teaching.

1. Decide how you plan to observe a criterion before you adopt it.
2. Do not select criteria that attempt to capture an overall quality of the classroom (e.g., "student engagement in the lesson").
3. Avoid vague or ambiguous terms.
4. Choose only specific and observable criteria.
5. Select criteria that will help you assess where you need to improve.
6. If you are having trouble deciding where you need to improve, observe a few other teachers and compare your behavior with theirs.
7. Use responses from the student questionnaire to help you identify specific areas of your teaching that need improvement.
8. Choose some subject-matter-specific criteria.

Now you are ready to proceed to self-assessment and collegial observation in the classroom.

cut here

Copy for you

TENTATIVE CRITERIA

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

Teacher's Name Date

cut here

Copy for your partner

TENTATIVE CRITERIA

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

Teacher's Name Date

Copy for field test team

TENTATIVE CRITERIA

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

cut here

Teacher's Name Date

cut here

FIELD TEST QUESTIONNAIRE NUMBER 3

Criteria Setting

1. Name ________________________________

2. How difficult was it for you and your partner to agree on criteria?

Extremely difficult	Very difficult	Moderately difficult	Slightly difficult	Not at all difficult

3. How useful were the student evaluations in guiding your selection of criteria?

Extremely useful	Very useful	Moderately useful	Slightly useful	Not at all useful

4. How confident are you that you will be able to assess your partner's teaching accurately with the criteria you have agreed on?

Extremely confident	Very confident	Moderately confident	Slightly confident	Not at all confident

5. In general, how important are those aspects of teaching which are tapped by the criteria you have agreed on?

Extremely important	Very important	Moderately important	Slightly important	Not at all important

6. How satisfied are you with your partner so far?

Extremely satisfied	Very satisfied	Moderately satisfied	Slightly satisfied	Not at all satisfied

7. How well has the manual explained the steps which you have completed so far?

Extremely well	Very well	Moderately well	Slightly well	Not at all well

8. What have been the most positive aspects of your experience with the Collegial Evaluation Program so far?

9. What have been the most negative aspects of your experience with the Collegial Evaluation Program so far?

10. How could the Collegial Evaluation Program be improved?

SECTION IV

SELF-EVALUATION

The next step in the program is to evaluate yourself, to take a fresh look at your teaching. Other parts of the evaluation process will enable you to compare your self-evaluation with the observations and perceptions of one (or more) of your colleagues. The student questionnaire that you have already administered and reviewed will enable you to compare your perception of your teaching and classroom environment with your students' perceptions. You may feel sometimes that feedback from colleagues and students is inaccurate or inappropriate, but in most cases it will help you to develop a realistic self-assessment and program for improvement. When you later think about these comparisons, you may find you have judged yourself too harshly or that you have not seen areas that need improvement. You will want to use your image of your assets and deficiencies, as well as suggestions from your partner, in drawing up a plan for continued improvement.

Your self-evaluation has two parts. The first contains questions which match those you will ask your students (Self-Assessment Form A). Students are your "clients." Therefore, their perceptions of your classroom teaching may not be as sophisticated as those of your colleagues. Yet, since even false images can have real consequences, perceptions by your students--whether accurate or inaccurate--form an important part of the classroom environment in which you do your work. It is worthwhile to be able to compare your image of the classroom directly with theirs.

Most of the teachers in the pilot test reported a remarkable degree of similarity between their responses on Self-Assessment Form A and student responses on the questionnaires. One of the teachers said, "I was very surprised to find that my own perceptions agreed fourteen out of twenty-one times with the student average. I think this proved that even though my class may not be the greatest one in the world, my students and I certainly agree on what it is."

For all the teachers, however, there were at least a few items where they disagreed substantially with their students. A word of warning is in order about such cases: it is easy to overstate the significance of these differences. For example, you may spend many hours assisting individual students with their problems and find that, on the average, students report receiving little assistance from you. Both you and they may be reporting accurately. The difference may be a product of there being only one of you and many of them. So, in comparing your self-evaluation with the reports of students, be sure to consider the meaning of the differences you find and do not mechanically contrast your perceptions with the students' average.

The second part of your self-evaluation asks you to rate yourself on the criteria that will later be observed in the classroom by your colleague (Self-Assessment Form B). We know it is difficult to judge yourself, but try to give yourself deserved compliments as well as honest criticism. Since we are all gifted with 20-20 hindsight, be sure to do this part of your self-evaluation before your teaching is observed. The greatest change in teaching performance comes when teachers receive evaluations that conflict with their earlier images of themselves. By rating yourself in advance, you give yourself a chance to compare your general image of your own teaching with the observation of particular teaching performances. Following each observation by your colleague, re-evaluate your performance during the lesson your partner observed, using the same criteria. In each case, you will be comparing your evaluations with those of your partner. When the evaluations conflict, you may be right and the observer may be wrong, but you will certainly have food for thought, discussion, and reassessment of some aspects of your own teaching performance.

The teachers in the pilot test were usually much harder on themselves than their colleagues were, so there were few disagreements on perceived weaknesses. Agreement between self- and colleague assessment seemed to legitimize the teachers' perceptions of their strengths and weaknesses. For example, one teacher commented that, "In discussion, I tend to rely on the same students, who always have the answers, and I do not phrase open-ended questions to include everyone." When her peer noted that "two boys spoke often. A few girls spoke occasionally but no one else entered the discussion," her self-assessment was confirmed. A good part of their first conference focused on how to increase student participation. In the second observation, the colleague noted that "the discussion included more students and some who had not previously participated. You praised the newcomers--Good."

Self-assessment not only provides you with systematic information on your own self-perceptions but also allows you to compare these perceptions with those of your students and partner. After you have compared your Self-Assessment Form A with the results of the Student Questionnaire, you may want to modify your list of criteria. If so, discuss the desired change in a short meeting with your partner. If not, you are ready for the first observation.

Name ______________________ Copy for you-page 1

SELF-ASSESSMENT FORM A

Student Questionnaire Items

1. How enjoyable do you make the course work to the students?

Extremely Enjoyable	Very Enjoyable	Moderately Enjoyable	Slightly Enjoyable	Not at All Enjoyable
1	2	3	4	5

2. How often do your students feel so confused about what's going on that they don't see any reason to try?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

3. How hard do you try to help the students when they have a problem with their class work?

Extremely Hard	Very Hard	Moderately Hard	Slightly Hard	Not at All Hard
1	2	3	4	5

4. How patient are you when students are having problems learning?

Extremely Patient	Very Patient	Moderately Patient	Slightly Patient	Not at All Patient
1	2	3	4	5

5. How interested are you in each student as a person?

Extremely Interested	Very Interested	Moderately Interested	Slightly Interested	Not at All Interested
1	2	3	4	5

6. How friendly are you to each student?

Extremely Friendly	Very Friendly	Moderately Friendly	Slightly Friendly	Not at All Friendly
1	2	3	4	5

7. How good is your sense of humor?

Extremely Good	Very Good	Moderately Good	Slightly Good	Not at All Good
1	2	3	4	5

8. How often do you encourage students to ask questions when they don't understand what's going on?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

cut here

Name ______________________________ Copy for you-page 2

9. How often do you help students when they have personal problems related to school?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

10. How difficult or easy for the students is the work they have to do?

Much Too Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Just Right	Somewhat Easy	Much Too Easy
1	2	3	4	5

11. How often do you try to figure out what work will be just right for each student?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

12. How often do you give students the freedom to choose the way they do the work?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

13. How often do you let students know they are doing good work?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

14. How important to your students is your liking them?

Extremely Important	Very Important	Moderately Important	Slightly Important	Not at All Important
1	2	3	4	5

15. How often are you available to talk with your students outside of class time?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

16. How often do you talk with your students outside of class time?

Very Frequently	Frequently	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

17. How orderly are the students during the class?

Extremely Orderly	Very Orderly	Moderately Orderly	Slightly Orderly	Not at All Orderly
1	2	3	4	5

18. When students do poor work, how often do you give them poor grades?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

cut here

Name ____________________ Copy for you-page 3

19. When students do good work, how often do you give them good grades?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

20. How often do you give good grades to students who work hard?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

21. How often do you give poor grades to students who do not work hard?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

22. How often do your students really pay attention in class?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

23. How often do you favor certain students in class?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

24. How well do you know the subject you are teaching?

Extremely Well	Very Well	Moderately Well	Slightly Well	Not at All Well
1	2	3	4	5

25. How clear to your students are your explanations of the class work?

Extremely Clear	Very Clear	Moderately Clear	Slightly Clear	Not at All Clear
1	2	3	4	5

26. How interested are your students in the material you are covering?

Extremely Interested	Very Interested	Moderately Interested	Slightly Interested	Not at All Interested
1	2	3	4	5

27. How important to your students is learning the material?

Extremely Important	Very Important	Moderately Important	Slightly Important	Not at All Important
1	2	3	4	5

cut here

cut here

Name ______________________ **Copy for your partner-page 1**

SELF-ASSESSMENT FORM A

Student Questionnaire Items

1. How enjoyable do you make the course work to the students?

Extremely Enjoyable	Very Enjoyable	Moderately Enjoyable	Slightly Enjoyable	Not at All Enjoyable
1	2	3	4	5

2. How often do your students feel so confused about what's going on that they don't see any reason to try?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

3. How hard do you try to help the students when they have a problem with their class work?

Extremely Hard	Very Hard	Moderately Hard	Slightly Hard	Not at All Hard
1	2	3	4	5

4. How patient are you when students are having problems learning?

Extremely Patient	Very Patient	Moderately Patient	Slightly Patient	Not at All Patient
1	2	3	4	5

5. How interested are you in each student as a person?

Extremely Interested	Very Interested	Moderately Interested	Slightly Interested	Not at All Interested
1	2	3	4	5

6. How friendly are you to each student?

Extremely Friendly	Very Friendly	Moderately Friendly	Slightly Friendly	Not at All Friendly
1	2	3	4	5

7. How good is your sense of humor?

Extremely Good	Very Good	Moderately Good	Slightly Good	Not at All Good
1	2	3	4	5

8. How often do you encourage students to ask questions when they don't understand what's going on?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

Name ____________________ Copy for your partner-page 2

9. How often do you help students when they have personal problems related to school?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

10. How difficult or easy for the students is the work they have to do?

Much Too Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Just Right	Somewhat Easy	Much Too Easy
1	2	3	4	5

11. How often do you try to figure out what work will be just right for each student?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

12. How often do you give students the freedom to choose the way they do the work?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

13. How often do you let students know they are doing good work?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

cut here

14. How important to your students is your liking them?

Extremely Important	Very Important	Moderately Important	Slightly Important	Not at All Important
1	2	3	4	5

15. How often are you available to talk with your students outside of class time?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

16. How often do you talk with your students outside of class time?

Very Frequently	Frequently	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

17. How orderly are the students during the class?

Extremely Orderly	Very Orderly	Moderately Orderly	Slightly Orderly	Not at All Orderly
1	2	3	4	5

18. When students do poor work, how often do you give them poor grades?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

cut here

Name ______________________________ **Copy for your partner-page 3**

19. When students do good work, how often do you give them good grades?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

20. How often do you give good grades to students who work hard?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

21. How often do you give poor grades to students who do not work hard?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

22. How often do your students really pay attention in class?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

23. How often do you favor certain students in class?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

24. How well do you know the subject you are teaching?

Extremely Well	Very Well	Moderately Well	Slightly Well	Not at All Well
1	2	3	4	5

25. How clear to your students are your explanations of the class work?

Extremely Clear	Very Clear	Moderately Clear	Slightly Clear	Not at All Clear
1	2	3	4	5

26. How interested are your students in the material you are covering?

Extremely Interested	Very Interested	Moderately Interested	Slightly Interested	Not at All Interested
1	2	3	4	5

27. How important to your students is learning the material?

Extremely Important	Very Important	Moderately Important	Slightly Important	Not at All Important
1	2	3	4	5

Name ______________________ **Copy for field test team-page 1**

cut here

SELF-ASSESSMENT FORM A

Student Questionnaire Items

1. How enjoyable do you make the course work to the students?

Extremely Enjoyable	Very Enjoyable	Moderately Enjoyable	Slightly Enjoyable	Not at All Enjoyable
1	2	3	4	5

2. How often do your students feel so confused about what's going on that they don't see any reason to try?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

3. How hard do you try to help the students when they have a problem with their class work?

Extremely Hard	Very Hard	Moderately Hard	Slightly Hard	Not at All Hard
1	2	3	4	5

4. How patient are you when students are having problems learning?

Extremely Patient	Very Patient	Moderately Patient	Slightly Patient	Not at All Patient
1	2	3	4	5

5. How interested are you in each student as a person?

Extremely Interested	Very Interested	Moderately Interested	Slightly Interested	Not at All Interested
1	2	3	4	5

6. How friendly are you to each student?

Extremely Friendly	Very Friendly	Moderately Friendly	Slightly Friendly	Not at All Friendly
1	2	3	4	5

7. How good is your sense of humor?

Extremely Good	Very Good	Moderately Good	Slightly Good	Not at All Good
1	2	3	4	5

8. How often do you encourage students to ask questions when they don't understand what's going on?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

Name ______________________ Copy for field test team-page 2

9. How often do you help students when they have personal problems related to school?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

10. How difficult or easy for the students is the work they have to do?

Much Too Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Just Right	Somewhat Easy	Much Too Easy
1	2	3	4	5

11. How often do you try to figure out what work will be just right for each student?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

12. How often do you give students the freedom to choose the way they do the work?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

13. How often do you let students know they are doing good work?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

14. How important to your students is your liking them?

Extremely Important	Very Important	Moderately Important	Slightly Important	Not at All Important
1	2	3	4	5

15. How often are you available to talk with your students outside of class time?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

16. How often do you talk with your students outside of class time?

Very Frequently	Frequently	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

17. How orderly are the students during the class?

Extremely Orderly	Very Orderly	Moderately Orderly	Slightly Orderly	Not at All Orderly
1	2	3	4	5

18. When students do poor work, how often do you give them poor grades?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

cut here

Name ______________________________

19. When students do good work, how often do you give them good grades?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

20. How often do you give good grades to students who work hard?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

21. How often do you give poor grades to students who do not work hard?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

22. How often do your students really pay attention in class?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

23. How often do you favor certain students in class?

Always	Usually	Fairly Often	Seldom	Never
1	2	3	4	5

cut here

24. How well do you know the subject you are teaching?

Extremely Well	Very Well	Moderately Well	Slightly Well	Not at All Well
1	2	3	4	5

25. How clear to your students are your explanations of the class work?

Extremely Clear	Very Clear	Moderately Clear	Slightly Clear	Not at All Clear
1	2	3	4	5

26. How interested are your students in the material you are covering?

Extremely Interested	Very Interested	Moderately Interested	Slightly Interested	Not at All Interested
1	2	3	4	5

27. How important to your students is learning the material?

Extremely Important	Very Important	Moderately Important	Slightly Important	Not at All Important
1	2	3	4	5

cut here

SELF-ASSESSMENT FORM B
Observation Criteria

SCALE: 1 = Very Satisfactory; 2 = Satisfactory; 3 = Needs Improvement; 4 = Needs Considerable Improvement

CRITERIA (to measure teaching performance)	EVALUATION (rate yourself using scale above)	COMMENTS
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		

Name ____________________ Date ____________

Copy for you

cut here

SELF-ASSESSMENT FORM B

Observation Criteria

Copy for your partner

SCALE: 1 = Very Satisfactory; 2 = Satisfactory; 3 = Needs Improvement; 4 = Needs Considerable Improvement

CRITERIA (to measure teaching performance)	EVALUATION (rate yourself using scale above)	COMMENTS
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		

Name ______________________ Date ______________

cut here

SELF-ASSESSMENT FORM B

Observation Criteria

Copy for field test team

SCALE: 1 = Very Satisfactory; 2 = Satisfactory; 3 = Needs Improvement; 4 = Needs Considerable Improvement

CRITERIA (to measure teaching performance)	EVALUATION (rate yourself using scale above)	COMMENTS
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		

Name ______________________ Date ______________

cut here

FIELD TEST QUESTIONNAIRE NUMBER 4

Self-Assessment

1. Name ____________________________

2. In general, how difficult was it for you to evaluate your own teaching?

Extremely difficult	Very difficult	Moderately difficult	Slightly difficult	Not at all difficult
1	2	3	4	5

3. More specifically, how difficult was it for you to evaluate your own teaching for the criteria you agreed on?

Extremely difficult	Very difficult	Moderately difficult	Slightly difficult	Not at all difficult
1	2	3	4	5

4. In general, how confident are you that your self-assessments are soundly based?

Extremely confident	Very confident	Moderately confident	Slightly confident	Not at all confident
1	2	3	4	5

5. How confident are you that the Collegial Evaluation Program will help you improve your teaching?

Extremely confident	Very confident	Moderately confident	Slightly confident	Not at all confident
1	2	3	4	5

6. How satisfied are you with your partner so far?

Extremely satisfied	Very satisfied	Moderately satisfied	Slightly satisfied	Not at all satisfied
1	2	3	4	5

7. How well has the manual explained the steps which you have completed so far?

Extremely well	Very well	Moderately well	Slightly well	Not at all well
1	2	3	4	5

8. What have been the most positive aspects of your experience with the Collegial Evaluation Program so far?

9. What have been the most negative aspects of your experience with the Collegial Evaluation Program so far?

10. How could the Collegial Evaluation Program be improved?

SECTION V

OBSERVATIONS AND CONFERENCES

The First Observation

A teacher about to be observed by a colleague is understandably nervous. We can do little to allay that nervousness except to note that continued participation in the collegial process will help to reduce it. One reason for tension preceding an observation is the rarity of classroom evaluations. This kindles a fear that judgments of one's teaching will be based on few, possibly atypical samples. Since we all have good days and bad days, we are more confident about any particular evaluation that is one of several evaluations covering a number of classroom sessions. The collegial process, with at least two sets of focused, shared observations, should ensure that a bad day will not unduly influence the evaluation.

But the conscientious teacher who is serving as observer may also be somewhat fearful. It is difficult to make sound evaluations in a classroom, and the observer as well as the teacher being observed is likely to be concerned about the quality of the evaluation. The pre-observation "jitters" may be reduced by following these suggestions: The observer should have thought carefully about both the criteria that have been agreed on and the classroom activity that is likely to be the focus of attention for each criterion. The First Observation Form should be examined in advance, for the rush of events in the classroom allows little time to develop familiarity with its structure. The criteria should have been written on the form during the meeting when they were selected. And, of course, the particular class to be observed should be known in advance by both the teacher and the observer. (Since the principal or department chairperson may need to help arrange classroom schedules to permit the observation, they too will need to know about the observation in advance.)

As much as possible, the choice of class and time of observation should be determined by the teacher to be observed. The teacher can select a class and time in which the activity is suitable for the criteria being used. For example, do not choose a lecture presentation if your criteria concern student interaction. The teacher should not select the session merely because it is likely to produce high evaluations.

The evaluation partners must decide in advance whether they object to note-taking during the observation period. Some teachers find note-taking while they are teaching a distracting and upsetting experience. For these teachers, their colleague must concentrate on watching and listening and write notes immediately after the observation. However, careful note-taking while observing does produce better and more complete information.

The observer should enter the class with the First Observation Form. The observer may sit in the rear of the classroom if the teacher is making a presentation, or nearby if the teacher is conducting a small group discussion or working with a student individually. As a general principle, the observer should always be as unobtrusive as possible. When recording observations, the observer should be careful not to "rattle" the teacher. For this reason, it is important that notes and reminders of events be succinct. Sudden bursts of note-taking activity by the observer must be avoided. Rather, the observer should make frequent, short comments that can serve as reminders to assist in developing a rating on each criterion and to provide specific examples for later feedback to the teacher. Let the flow of events in the classroom determine which criterion is being used at a specific time during the class. Do not try to observe by using one criterion at a time in a specified order.

What is observed, no matter how significant at the time, will be forgotten with the passage of hours. Therefore, the colleague who observes must give priority to squeezing in, directly after the session or at least before bedtime, the necessary half hour for rating the teacher on each criterion and spelling out the examples and suggestions under "Comments." These comments may consist of a few words, or may extend to the back of the form for more elaborate remarks. It is far more important that good examples or striking incidents be recorded than that the form be neat.

Observation forms should be exchanged *at the same time*, as soon as both teachers have been observed. The forms should communicate a message on their own, without extended discussion. An immediate response would probably be more emotional than informative. The time to discuss the observations is at the next conference.

Teachers in the pilot test said they learned as much from observing as from being observed. They were able to identify a host of specific teaching techniques and ideas for lessons, picked up while observing, which they could use in their own classrooms. All participants also responded very positively to the opportunity to observe other teaching styles systematically. Teachers rarely have this opportunity, especially if they are in self-contained classrooms. Even the teachers in open space areas remarked that they were usually too busy to observe their teammates, and appreciated the chance. All teachers also appreciated the specific criteria for focusing the observation.

These teachers' suggestions reiterate our procedures for ensuring good observations.

1. The teacher being observed should determine when the observation will be conducted.
2. The class activity that is observed should be appropriate to the criteria.
3. Observers should complete the observation form immediately after the observation.

The First Conference

The conferences in collegial evaluation serve two main purposes. First, partners report and discuss each other's observations of classroom teaching. Second, together you develop specific programs for improving your teaching.

Conferences should be scheduled soon after both teachers have been observed. A relaxed and quiet setting away from the usual demands of the school day is ideal. A classroom after school, a conference room, or even a private home can encourage a focused yet informal setting; but any place that permits privacy and confidentiality is adequate.

What tone should be set for the conferences? It is essential that the climate of the conference be informal, open, and as supportive as possible. The primary purpose of the collegial process is to improve teaching through evaluation, and this will happen only when observations and appraisals of teaching use common criteria, are communicated honestly, and are truly heard. Each teacher, in turn, plays two roles: straightforward yet supportive reporter, and receptive listener.

Teaching strengths should receive some attention--everyone loves a pat on the back. But everyone also has weaknesses, and improving them is the chief purpose of the Collegial Evaluation Program. Attention should therefore be focused primarily on areas in which teaching performance does not measure up to the evaluation criteria. Giving constructive criticism and developing specific directions for improvement are essential to the collegial process of improving teaching. The conferences are the components of the program in which both occur. A tone of honesty, straightforwardness, and willingness to accept constructive criticism is a goal worth striving for.

What are the necessary steps in the first conference? At least a day before the conference you should exchange observation forms. Bring your self-evaluations, self-observations, and student questionnaire results to the meeting. Agree to a time limit (of, say, an hour or an hour and a half) before beginning your conference. We recommend the following agenda:

1. Clarify your understanding of the general comments on the second page of the First Observation Form.

2. In turn, discuss the criteria on which both you and your partner agree that no improvement is needed (i.e., where ratings are "very satisfactory" or "satisfactory" and comments are all positive). Give each other some well-deserved positive reinforcement.

3. In turn, discuss those criteria where both of you agree that improvement is needed. At this time you may exchange some preliminary suggestions on how to improve in some of these areas.

4. Try to resolve any discrepancies between your self-evaluations, self-observations, and your partner's assessment. (There are at least three possible reasons why you disagree. First, the observer may have focused on inappropriate aspects of the teaching performance. Second, the teacher may not be aware of aspects of his or her behavior in the classroom. Third, there may be circumstances unknown to the observer that have influenced the teacher's behavior during the single sample of teaching. Some of these may be temporary, such as a disruption by a student during the previous hour. Others may be long-term, such as a student's continued emotional and learning problems.) Disagreements, fully explored, may lead either to different behavior by the teacher or new emphases by the observer.

5. The last step in the conference is to structure the second observation. On the basis of the first set of observations it should be possible to identify areas of teaching that need to be emphasized during the second observation. These may include areas of weakness for the teacher to work on before the next observation or new emphases for the observer. There may also be areas in which disagreements persist, and the partners should consider what additional information from the second observation could help resolve the impasse. You may decide to delete a criterion on which you and your partner agree no improvement is needed. You may also wish to add new criteria. Be sure you both agree on the revised list of criteria and that all are specific and observable.

The experiences of teachers who took part in the pilot test may illustrate what you can expect from the conferences. These teachers agreed that the collegial conferences were quite different from conferences in which the principal evaluated a teacher's performance. As one teacher said, "Instead of having someone tell you, 'You should do X to improve,' a colleague was more likely to say, 'X worked well for me.' This approach is less threatening and more legitimate." Another difference between collegial and typical hierarchical evaluation conferences was that all the teachers received some praise. This seemed to fill a very great need. Praise helped reinforce good practices and was thought by the teachers to be as important in improving teaching as criticism.

Teachers gave each other feedback in virtually every area of teaching. Some comments assessed the classroom environment. For instance, one observer said of a group activity, "People are noisy--that doesn't bother me. They are talking, getting excited, and having fun." An art teacher told his partner that clean-up period was "utter chaos" and that in the future students should be assigned responsibilities for cleaning up after themselves.

Much of the feedback in conferences focused on the teacher's behavior. A number of comments related to subject matter. Teachers gave each other useful information about the quality of materials used in lessons, the appropriateness of their language for the classroom, the clarity of their objectives and directions, and specific techniques for making their lessons more interesting. Comments ranged from general observations such as "The material is going over the kids' heads," to a number of specific comments, e.g., "Your explanation of chromatic half steps and use of the term 'leading on' was a little complicated." Similarly, suggestions included general recommendations useful in improving overall performance, "You should take at least a half hour to present material you are now covering in ten minutes," and specific suggestions for conveying a single idea better, "Why not give each student a copy of the keyboard to follow along your explanation of chromatic half steps?"

In the pilot test there was a remarkable amount of agreement among self, peer, and student assessments. In most cases a teaching weakness identified by one of these sources was also identified by the other two. For example, one teacher listed as a criterion, "Do not ignore any segment of the class concerning questions or needs--give attention equally." Several students reported on the questionnaire that they were "seldom" or "never" encouraged to ask questions in class. Her colleague said, "The less capable students are not involved, especially those at the back."

Teachers in the field made the following procedural suggestions:

1. Complete the Observation Form (where ratings and comments on the partner's performance are written) immediately after observing.
2. The most important element of a good conference is to be straightforward, honest, and yet sensitive to your partner's feelings.
3. Schedule your conferences within two to three days after observing each other.
4. Follow the conference agenda provided in this manual. It will save you time.
5. Try to complete each conference within one to one and a half hours.

The Second Observation

Toward the end of the first conference or some other time before the second observation the pair of teachers should decide whether to observe the same type of classroom session or whether to switch to another. In an elementary school, a totally different lesson may provide a better basis for the second evaluation. In a high school, it may be useful to observe the teacher with a different group of students. Each choice--a similar activity or a new one, the same students or different ones--has its advantages. If the same type of teaching is observed, direct comparisons can be made between the two teaching performances, providing more reliable information, and enabling the partners to see whether some aspects of teaching have indeed changed since the first observation and conference. But observing a different kind of teaching also has advantages, since the evaluator gets a broader view of the teaching performance of his or her colleague. The feedback can then relate the quality of each performance to the particular nature of the task faced by the teacher. The choice should depend on the nature of the observations needed to develop the improvement plans. If a teacher doubts the validity of ratings on certain criteria, the observer must strive for more specific notes and detailed records for those criteria during the second observation.

The observation forms, the rating scale, and the observation procedures are the same for the second observation as for the first. The colleague who is observing has a duty to be alert to positive changes in teaching performance. If teaching is to improve, each teacher must receive appropriate support from the observing partner. Therefore, no opportunity should be lost to record, in ratings and comments, each small step toward more effective teaching. Accentuating the positive aspects of evaluation is necessary if teachers are to be reinforced as they strive to improve their teaching skills.

The Second Conference

The second conference should be held as soon as possible after the observation forms have been exchanged. We recommend the following agenda.

1. - 4. Follow the first four steps of the first conference.

5. Decide whether you wish to bring in another observer for one or both of you. A third observer could provide a different perspective and/or resolve major disagreements between you and your partner. You may choose another teacher, a principal or any other person whom you believe to be competent in assessing your behavior. This additional observer will use the same Observation Form, visit the classroom before the third and final conference, and attend the final conference.

6. Begin to develop preliminary plans for improvement by seeking consensus about the areas of teaching in which you will try to improve.

Following the conference, you and your partner should summarize your observations, noting areas of strength and of weakness, and making specific suggestions for improvement. Record this information on the form provided--the Summary of Observations and Suggestions for Improvement. Exchange these summaries with your partner several days before the final conference.

cut here

FIRST OBSERVATION FORM

Copy for you - page 1

Date: ____________ Teacher: ____________

School: ____________ Evaluator: ____________

Class Observed: ____________ Date Observed: ____________

SCALE: 1 = Very Satisfactory; 2 = Satisfactory; 3 = Needs Improvement;
4 = Needs Considerable Improvement

CRITERIA	EVALUATION	COMMENTS
(to measure teacher performance)	(use scale above)	
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		

cut here

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Teacher's Name ______________________ Evaluator's Name ________________________

Copy for you - page 2

cut here

Copy for your partner - page 1

FIRST OBSERVATION FORM

Teacher: ____________

Evaluator: ____________

Date Observed: ____________

Date: ____________

School: ____________

Class Observed: ____________

SCALE: 1 = Very Satisfactory; 2 = Satisfactory; 3 = Needs Improvement;
4 = Needs Considerable Improvement

CRITERIA (to measure teacher performance)	EVALUATION (use scale above)	COMMENTS
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		

cut here

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Teacher's Name ______________________________ Evaluator's Name ______________________________

Copy for your partner - page 2

cut here

Copy for field test team - page 1

FIRST OBSERVATION FORM

Date: ____________________ Teacher: ____________________

School: ____________________ Evaluator: ____________________

Class Observed: ____________________ Date Observed: ____________________

SCALE: 1 = Very Satisfactory; 2 = Satisfactory; 3 = Needs Improvement;
4 = Needs Considerable Improvement

CRITERIA (to measure teacher performance)	EVALUATION (use scale above)	COMMENTS
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		

cut here

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Copy for field test team - page 2

Teacher's Name ______________________ Evaluator's Name ______________________

cut here

Copy for you

FIRST SELF-OBSERVATION FORM

Date: ____________ Teacher: ____________

School: ____________ Class Observed: ____________

SCALE: 1 = Very Satisfactory; 2 = Satisfactory; 3 = Needs Improvement;
4 = Needs Considerable Improvement

CRITERIA (to measure teacher performance)	EVALUATION (use scale above)	COMMENTS
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		

GENERAL COMMENTS:

cut here

SCALE: 1 = Very Satisfactory; 2 = Satisfactory; 3 = Needs Improvement;
4 = Needs Considerable Improvement

CRITERIA (to measure teacher performance)	EVALUATION (use scale above)	COMMENTS
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		

GENERAL COMMENTS:

FIRST SELF-OBSERVATION FORM

Date: ____________ Teacher: ____________

School: ____________ Class Observed: ____________

Copy for your partner

cut here

FIRST SELF-OBSERVATION FORM

Date: ____________________

School: ____________________

Teacher: ____________________

Class Observed: ____________________

copy for field test team

SCALE: 1 = Very Satisfactory; 2 = Satisfactory; 3 = Needs Improvement;
4 = Needs Considerable Improvement

CRITERIA (to measure teacher performance)	EVALUATION (use scale above)	COMMENTS
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		

GENERAL COMMENTS:

cut here

FIELD TEST QUESTIONNAIRE NUMBER 5

Observations #1

1. Name ______________________________

2. How relevant to the class session you observed were the criteria you and your partner had selected?

Extremely relevant	Very relevant	Moderately relevant	Slightly relevant	Not at all relevant

3. How difficult was it for you to evaluate your partner's teaching performance using the criteria you agreed on?

Extremely difficult	Very difficult	Moderately difficult	Slightly difficult	Not at all difficult

4. How confident are you that your observations of your partner's teaching are soundly based?

Extremely confident	Very confident	Moderately confident	Slightly confident	Not at all confident

5. How confident are you that your partner's observations of your teaching are soundly based?

Extremely confident	Very confident	Moderately confident	Slightly confident	Not at all confident

6. How anxious were you while your partner was observing teaching?

Extremely anxious	Very anxious	Moderately anxious	Slightly anxious	Not at all anxious

7. How confident are you that the Collegial Evaluation Program will help you improve your teaching?

Extremely confident	Very confident	Moderately confident	Slightly confident	Not at all confident

8. How satisfied are you with your partner so far?

Extremely satisfied	Very satisfied	Moderately satisfied	Slightly satisfied	Not at all satisfied

9. How well has the manual explained the steps which you have completed so far?

Extremely well	Very well	Moderately well	Slightly well	Not at all well

10. What have been the most positive aspects of your experience with the Collegial Evaluation Program so far?

cut here

Name ______________________________

11. What have been the most negative aspects of your experience with the Collegial Evaluation Program?

12. How could the Collegial Evaluation Program be improved?

FIELD TEST QUESTIONNAIRE NUMBER 6

Conference #1

1. Name ______________________________

2. How long was this conference? ______ hours ______ minutes

3. How difficult was it for you to be open and honest with your partner?

Extremely difficult	Very difficult	Moderately difficult	Slightly difficult	Not at all difficult

4. How difficult do you believe it was for your partner to be open and honest with you?

Extremely difficult	Very difficult	Moderately difficult	Slightly difficult	Not at all difficult

5. How helpful was your partner's evaluation of your teaching?

Extremely helpful	Very helpful	Moderately helpful	Slightly helpful	Not at all helpful

6. How satisfied are you with your partner so far?

Extremely satisfied	Very satisfied	Moderately satisfied	Slightly satisfied	Not at all satisfied

7. How hopeful are you that Collegial Evaluation will help you to improve your teaching?

Extremely hopeful	Very hopeful	Moderately hopeful	Slightly hopeful	Not at all hopeful

8. How well has the manual explained the steps you have completed so far?

Extremely well	Very well	Moderately well	Slightly well	Not at all well

9. What have been the most positive aspects of your experience with the Collegial Evaluation Program so far?

10. What have been the most negative aspects of your experience with the Collegial Evaluation Program so far?

11. How could the Collegial Evaluation Program be improved?

cut here

cut here

Copy for you - page 1

SECOND OBSERVATION FORM

Date: ____________ Teacher: ____________

School: ____________ Evaluator: ____________

Class Observed: ____________ Date Observed: ____________

SCALE: 1 = Very Satisfactory; 2 = Satisfactory; 3 = Needs Improvement;
4 = Needs Considerable Improvement

CRITERIA (to measure teacher performance)	EVALUATION (use scale above)	COMMENTS
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		

cut here

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Teacher's Name ______________________ Evaluator's Name ______________________

Copy for you - page 2

cut here

Copy for your partner - page 1

SECOND OBSERVATION FORM

Teacher: ______ Date: ______

Evaluator: ______ School: ______

Date Observed: ______ Class Observed: ______

SCALE: 1 = Very Satisfactory; 2 = Satisfactory; 3 = Needs Improvement;
4 = Needs Considerable Improvement

CRITERIA (to measure teacher performance)	EVALUATION (use scale above)	COMMENTS
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		

cut here

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Teacher's Name ______________________ Evaluator's Name ______________________

Copy for your partner - page 2

cut here

SCALE: 1 = Very Satisfactory; 2 = Satisfactory; 3 = Needs Improvement;
4 = Needs Considerable Improvement

CRITERIA (to measure teacher performance)	EVALUATION (use scale above)	COMMENTS
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		

Copy for field test team - page 1

SECOND OBSERVATION FORM

Date: ____________ Teacher: ____________

School: ____________ Evaluator: ____________

Class Observed: ____________ Date Observed: ____________

cut here

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Teacher's Name ______________________ Evaluator's Name ________________________

Copy for field test team - page 2

cut here

SCALE: 1 = Very Satisfactory; 2 = Satisfactory; 3 = Needs Improvement;
4 = Needs Considerable Improvement

CRITERIA (to measure teacher performance)	EVALUATION (use scale above)	COMMENTS
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		

GENERAL COMMENTS:

SECOND SELF-OBSERVATION FORM

Copy for you

Date: ______________________ Teacher: ______________________

School: ______________________ Class Observed: ______________________

cut here

Copy for your partner

SECOND SELF-OBSERVATION FORM

Date: ____________ Teacher: ____________

School: ____________ Class Observed: ____________

SCALE: 1 = Very Satisfactory; 2 = Satisfactory; 3 = Needs Improvement;
4 = Needs Considerable Improvement

CRITERIA (to measure teacher performance)	EVALUATION (use scale above)	COMMENTS
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		

GENERAL COMMENTS:

cut here

SECOND SELF-OBSERVATION FORM

Copy for field test team

Date: ____________________ Teacher: ____________________

School: ____________________ Class Observed: ____________________

SCALE: 1 = Very Satisfactory; 2 = Satisfactory; 3 = Needs Improvement;
4 = Needs Considerable Improvement

CRITERIA	EVALUATION	COMMENTS
(to measure teacher performance)	(use scale above)	
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		

GENERAL COMMENTS:

FIELD TEST QUESTIONNAIRE NUMBER 7

Observation #2

1. Name ________________________________

2. How relevant to the class session you observed were the criteria you and your partner had selected?

Extremely relevant	Very relevant	Moderately relevant	Slightly relevant	Not at all relevant

3. How difficult was it for you to evaluate your partner's teaching performance using the criteria you agreed on?

Extremely difficult	Very difficult	Moderately difficult	Slightly difficult	Not at all difficult

4. How confident are you that your observations of your partner's teaching are soundly based?

Extremely confident	Very confident	Moderately confident	Slightly confident	Not at all confident

5. How confident are you that your partner's observations of your teaching are soundly based?

Extremely confident	Very confident	Moderately confident	Slightly confident	Not at all confident

6. How anxious were you while your partner was observing teaching?

Extremely anxious	Very anxious	Moderately anxious	Slightly anxious	Not at all anxious

7. How confident are you that the Collegial Evaluation Program will help you improve your teaching?

Extremely confident	Very confident	Moderately confident	Slightly confident	Not at all confident

8. How satisfied are you with your partner so far?

Extremely satisfied	Very satisfied	Moderately satisfied	Slightly satisfied	Not at all satisfied

9. How well has the manual explained the steps which you have completed so far?

Extremely well	Very well	Moderately well	Slightly well	Not at all well

10. What have been the most positive aspects of your experience with the Collegial Evaluation Program so far?

cut here

cut here

Name ________________________________

11. What have been the most negative aspects of your experience with the Collegial Evaluation Program?

12. How could the Collegial Evaluation Program be improved?

FIELD TEST QUESTIONNAIRE NUMBER 8

Conference #2

1. Name ______________________________

2. How long was this conference? ________ hours _______ minutes

3. How difficult was it for you to be open and honest with your partner?

Extremely difficult	Very difficult	Moderately difficult	Slightly difficult	Not at all difficult

4. How difficult do you believe it was for your partner to be open and honest with you?

Extremely difficult	Very difficult	Moderately difficult	Slightly difficult	Not at all difficult

5. How helpful was your partner's evaluation of your teaching?

Extremely helpful	Very helpful	Moderately helpful	Slightly helpful	Not at all helpful

6. How satisfied are you with your partner so far?

Extremely satisfied	Very satisfied	Moderately satisfied	Slightly satisfied	Not at all satisfied

7. How hopeful are you that Collegial Evaluation will help you to improve your teaching?

Extremely hopeful	Very hopeful	Moderately hopeful	Slightly hopeful	Not at all hopeful

8. How well has the manual explained the steps which you have completed so far?

Extremely well	Very well	Moderately well	Slightly well	Not at all well

9. What have been the most positive aspects of your experience with the Collegial Evaluation Program so far?

10. What have been the most negative aspects of your experience with the Collegial Evaluation Program so far?

11. How could the Collegial Evaluation Program be improved?

cut here

SECTION VI

A PLAN FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

You are now ready to draw up a plan for professional improvement based on what you have learned about your teaching. This final step of the program consists of three phases: pre-conference activities, the final conference, and post-conference activities.

Pre-conference Activities

The quality of your improvement plan depends on the quality of the assessments you have received from your colleague, your students, and yourself. It is therefore essential that you carefully review the forms containing this information before conferring with your partner.

To save time during the conference and to help you prepare, collate the information you have gathered and fill out the Summary of Evaluations form in the following steps:

1. First, review Self-Assessment Form A, which you completed near the beginning of the program. Summarize your responses by listing your strengths and weaknesses on the Summary of Evaluations form under Self-Assessment, Form A (Questionnaire).

2. Review your Self-Assessment Form B, where you rated yourself on each of the shared criteria. Summarize this self-assessment by listing strengths and weaknesses on the Summary of Evaluations form under Self-Assessment, Form B (Shared Criteria).

3. Review the mean responses and the distribution of responses on the Student Questionnaire. Summarize this information by writing

students' perceptions of your strengths and weaknesses on the form under Student Questionnaire.

4. Review your own Self-Observation forms.

5. Read the Summary of Observations and Suggestions for Improvement form you received from your partner. Put a "C" for "consensus" by those strengths and weaknesses on which all sources (your colleague, most of your students, and yourself) agree. Put a "D" by those concerning which there are discrepancies, and list them under Discrepancies in Assessment on the Summary of Evaluations form.

6. Using the suggestions for improvement that you received from your partner, as well as your own ideas, develop a number of tentative means of improvement in each area for which a weakness was noted. List them under Suggestions for Improvement.

Next, arrange a time to meet with your partner (and an additional observer if necessary) for the final conference. Allot two hours for this conference and try to hold it at a time when all the participants are both rested and relaxed.

The Final Conference

The purpose of the final conference between you and your partner is to draw together all that you have learned from the collegial process in order to develop a plan to improve your teaching. If another teacher, your principal, or anyone else has observed in the classroom, discuss his or her observations too.

The final conference should begin with Step 1 if someone outside the collegial pair has observed in the classroom. If not, begin with Step 2.

1. Begin the conference by talking with the additional observer. As before, raise as many questions about the observation form as may be needed to explore the general basis for the evaluations. The rating for each criterion should then be discussed, this time noting particularly how this evaluation reinforces or contradicts earlier ones. Agreement on either strengths or weaknesses should give you confidence in the soundness of the total evaluation. Where discrepancies persist, explore them in some depth to determine their implications for teacher or observer. The third observer should then leave the conference.

2. Take up the integration of the self-assessment, self-observations, student evaluations, and collegial evaluations. Each teacher may assume the lead in presenting information on his or her teaching from these sources, which has been summarized on the Summary of Evaluations form.

   (a) Discuss and summarize major strengths and weaknesses listed under Self-Assessment and Self-Observations.

   (b) Summarize the major strengths and weaknesses listed under Student Questionnaire.

   (c) Discuss the major strengths and weaknesses communicated by your partner in prior conferences and on the Summary of Observations and Suggestions for Improvement form.

   (d) Discuss consistencies and discrepancies among these three sources. This is probably the most important step in producing a plan for professional development.

   (e) From this information you will be able, after the conference, to integrate the evaluations and write your master list of areas of strength and areas that need improvement on the Plan for Professional Development form. Try to limit the number to five.

3. This step in the conference is the most important one. You will help one another decide on specific strategies for improvement.

   (a) Discuss, in turn, your suggested activities aimed at improvement and write down on the Summary of Evaluations form any revisions made as a result of integrating your evaluations.

(b) Check each suggestion to make sure that it gives you specific guidelines.

(c) List your intended activities under "What efforts will you make to improve in this area?" on the Plan for Professional Development form.

4. Briefly review the plan and help one another decide for each specific area the best way to assess the results of your efforts. List the assessment plans on the Plan for Professional Development form.

5. Now look over both your plans for improvement and assessment. Discuss the assistance you may require to enable you to carry out the plans. List any assistance and resources you need from colleagues, your principal, or other sources on the last page of the Plan for Professional Development form.

6. At the end of the conference, decide

(a) whether each of you will carry out the Professional Development Plan alone, continue the evaluation process with the same partner, or continue with another partner; and

(b) whether to hold a conference with the principal to ask for support or resources in order to implement your plan.

Post-conference Activities

We hope that you will use the Collegial Evaluation Program as a means of improving your teaching throughout your career. Now that you are thoroughly familiar with the process and comfortable with it, another series of observations, conferences, and self- and student assessments should be less time consuming than the first. The Professional Development Plan can be used as a source of criteria for the next round. Many of the teachers in the pilot test found a second round an excellent way to assess their efforts to improve. We hope you will too.

Examples of Professional Development Plans

To give you a sample of the diversity and usefulness of improvement plans, we would like to share with you some of those generated by teachers in the pilot test. These plans spanned the whole range of teaching activities--presentation of subject matter, classroom control, motivation, students' interest and involvement, positive reinforcement, and classroom organization and atmosphere. Some of the improvement plans called for relatively minor changes; others required major reorganization of the classroom and substantial changes in teacher behavior.

Part of one teacher's plan was as follows: "With the help of my peer, I will first identify those students whom I have ignored. I will make a point of talking to each of them every day. I'll keep a checklist to make sure I spend some time with each of these children." Another teacher planned to solve a similar problem in a different way. To encourage the nonparticipators at the back, she decided to rearrange the class and move the pupils at the back into the first two rows. She also said she would "give those individuals who have not been participating responsibility for explaining things to the class and helping others with their work."

Two teachers wanted a quieter learning environment--a typical problem in open-space schools. After observing one another, they discovered that the noisiest time of the day was when they grouped their students by ability in math and language arts. The noise came from the lower ability youngsters. The teachers decided to experiment with heterogeneous grouping.

An art teacher who was concerned about giving appropriate positive reinforcement for good work learned from his peer that he had not displayed any student work in the classroom. He planned to "reserve a large space in the art room, school library, and hall display cases for the exhibition of student work." Another teacher who complained that he never had time to finish his lesson decided that he would save a few minutes each period by letting students distribute and collect all lesson material rather than do it himself.

Plans for assessment were as varied as improvement strategies. When teachers were planning to improve their presentation of subject matter, they often relied on student cognitive outcomes as a measure of their success. The teacher who planned to explain and define terms more carefully said one indicator of his progress would be the number of times students used the new terms in their essays.

A number of the teachers decided to use the Student Questionnaire as a posttest device. Comparing the student responses after the improvement strategy had been implemented with those from before would help them assess their progress in motivating students, evaluating them, displaying interest in them, presenting material clearly, individualizing subject matter, and developing suitable material.

The teachers who participated in the pilot test made the following suggestions as a result of their experience in developing, carrying out, and assessing their plans for professional development.

1. Consider information from all sources--self, students, and partner--in defining your areas of strength and weakness.
2. Formulate very specific strategies for each area of weakness you identify.
3. Try to implement these strategies soon after the final conference.
4. Use cognitive tests to measure the degree to which your presentation of subject matter has improved.

5. Administer the Student Questionnaire as a posttest to see whether your teaching has improved in certain ways.
6. Invite your partner or another teacher to observe your progress in implementing the Improvement Plan. The strategies for improvement should suggest criteria for the observations.

Most of the teachers in our pilot test planned to use collegial observations and conferences to assess their improvement. Many immediately set up times to begin another round of observations--some with their original partners, others with new ones--using their strategies for improvement as the new criteria. They planned to continue the evaluation process throughout the school year. As one teacher said,

> I need to have this kind of peer evaluation on a regular basis. If my peer evaluated me throughout the year, she would have an understanding of the trends in my teaching and in a particular class and the evaluation would be even more helpful. She would be able to detect subtle problem areas that I may not be aware of. I could do the same for her and also continue to learn a lot by observing another teacher at work.

Name ______________________ Copy for you

SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Summary of Observations and Conferences

Criterion	Strengths	Weaknesses

Colleague's Suggestions for Improvement

Criterion	Suggested Improvement

cut here

Name ____________________ Copy for you - page 1

SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS

(Strengths and Weaknesses)

Self-Assessment

Form A (Questionnaire)

Form B (Observation Items)

Student Questionnaire

Observations (by Colleague and Self) and Conferences

cut here

Name ______________________

Copy for you - page 2

cut here

Discrepancies in Assessments

Criterion	Discrepancy

Colleague's Suggestions for Improvement

Criterion	Suggested Improvement

Name ______________________

Copy for you - page 1

PLAN FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

From combining all the evaluations, what do you think are five areas of strength in your teaching?

1. ______________________
2. ______________________
3. ______________________
4. ______________________
5. ______________________

From combining all the evaluations, what do you think are five areas of your teaching that need improvement? (List them in order of importance to you.)

Area 1. ______________________

Area 2. ______________________

Area 3. ______________________

Area 4. ______________________

Area 5. ______________________

Area 1.

What efforts will you make to improve in this area? ______________________

____

____

____

How will you assess the results of your efforts? ______________________

____

____

____

cut here

Name ____________________ Copy for you - page 2

Area 2:

What efforts will you make to improve in this area? ____________

How will you assess the results of your efforts? ____________

Area 3:

What efforts will you make to improve in this area? ____________

How will you assess the results of your efforts? ____________

Area 4:

What efforts will you make to improve in this area? ____________

How will you assess the results of your efforts? ____________

cut here

Name ______________________________ Copy for you - page 3

Area 5.

What efforts will you make to improve in this area? ______________

How will you assess the results of your efforts? ______________

What assistance do you need to improve your teaching

from your colleagues? ______________

from your principal? ______________

from other sources (materials, audio-visual equipment, etc.)? ____

cut here

Name ______________________________ Copy for your partner

SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Summary of Observations and Conferences

Criterion	Strengths	Weaknesses

cut here

Colleague's Suggestions for Improvement

Criterion	Suggested Improvement

cut here

Name ______________________________ Copy for your partner - page 1

SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS

(Strengths and Weaknesses)

Self-Assessment

Form A (Questionnaire)

Form B (Observation Items)

Student Questionnaire

Observations (by Colleague and Self) and Conferences

Name ______________________

Copy for your partner - page 2

Discrepancies in Assessments

Criterion	Discrepancy

Colleague's Suggestions for Improvement

Criterion	Suggested Improvement

cut here

Name ____________________ Copy for your partner - page 1

cut here

PLAN FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

From combining all the evaluations, what do you think are five areas of strength in your teaching?

1. ____________________
2. ____________________
3. ____________________
4. ____________________
5. ____________________

From combining all the evaluations, what do you think are five areas of your teaching that need improvement? (List them in order of importance to you.)

Area 1. ____________________
Area 2. ____________________
Area 3. ____________________
Area 4. ____________________
Area 5. ____________________

Area 1.

What efforts will you make to improve in this area? ____________________

____

____

____

How will you assess the results of your efforts? ____________________

____

____

____

cut here

Name ______________________

Copy for your partner - page 2

Area 2:

What efforts will you make to improve in this area? ______________

How will you assess the results of your efforts? ______________

Area 3:

What efforts will you make to improve in this area? ______________

How will you assess the results of your efforts? ______________

Area 4:

What efforts will you make to improve in this area? ______________

How will you assess the results of your efforts? ______________

cut here

Name ______________________ Copy for your partner - page 3

Area 5:

What efforts will you make to improve in this area? ______________

How will you assess the results of your efforts? ______________

What assistance do you need to improve your teaching--

from your colleagues? ______________

from your principal? ______________

from other sources (materials, audio-visual equipment, etc.)? _____

cut here

Name ______________________________ Copy for field test team

SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Summary of Observations and Conferences

Criterion	Strengths	Weaknesses

Colleague's Suggestions for Improvement

Criterion	Suggested Improvement

Name ______________________ Copy for field test team - page 1

SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS

(Strengths and Weaknesses)

Self-Assessment

Form A (Questionnaire)

Form B (Observation Items)

Student Questionnaire

Observations (by Colleague and Self) and Conferences

cut here

cut here

Name ______________________

Copy for field test team - page 2

Discrepancies in Assessments

Criterion	Discrepancy

Colleague's Suggestions for Improvement

Criterion	Suggested Improvement

Name ____________________ Copy for field test team - page 1

PLAN FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

From combining all the evaluations, what do you think are five areas of strength in your teaching?

1. ____________________
2. ____________________
3. ____________________
4. ____________________
5. ____________________

From combining all the evaluations, what do you think are five areas of your teaching that need improvement? (List them in order of importance to you.)

Area 1. ____________________

Area 2. ____________________

Area 3. ____________________

Area 4. ____________________

Area 5. ____________________

Area 1:

What efforts will you make to improve in this area? __________

____

____

____

How will you assess the results of your efforts? __________

____

____

____

cut here

cut here

Name ______________________ Copy for field test team - page 2

Area 2:

What efforts will you make to improve in this area? ____________

How will you assess the results of your efforts? ____________

Area 3:

What efforts will you make to improve in this area? ____________

How will you assess the results of your efforts? ____________

Area 4:

What efforts will you make to improve in this area? ____________

How will you assess the results of your efforts? ____________

Name ____________________

Area 5:

What efforts will you make to improve in this area? ____________

How will you assess the results of your efforts? ____________

What assistance do you need to improve your teaching--

from your colleagues? ____________

from your principal? ____________

from other sources (materials, audio-visual equipment, etc.)? ____

cut here

cut here

FIELD TEST QUESTIONNAIRE NUMBER 9

Wrap-up Conference and Plan for Professional Development

1. Name ____

2. How long was the conference? ________ hours ________ minutes

3. How specific are the strategies which you listed in your plan for improvement?

Extremely specific	Very specific	Moderately specific	Slightly specific	Not at all specific

4. How confident are you that your plan for improvement will help improve your teaching?

Extremely confident	Very confident	Moderately confident	Slightly confident	Not at all confident

5. How difficult do you think it will be for you to implement your plan for improvement?

Extremely difficult	Very difficult	Moderately difficult	Slightly difficult	Not at all difficult

6. How often do you informally talk with other teachers about ways of improving your teaching?

Never	Few times a year	About once a month	Once a week	Several times a week

7. How friendly do you feel toward your partner?

Extremely friendly	Very friendly	Moderately friendly	Slightly friendly	Not at all friendly

8. How similar is your philosophy of teaching to that of your partner?

Extremely similar	Very similar	Moderately similar	Slightly similar	Not at all similar

9. How satisfied with your partner are you so far?

Extremely satisfied	Very satisfied	Moderately satisfied	Slightly satisfied	Not at all satisfied

10. How well has the manual explained the steps which you have completed so far?

Extremely well	Very well	Moderately well	Slightly well	Not at all well

Name ______________________________

11. What have been the most positive aspects of your experience with the Collegial Evaluation Program so far?

12. What have been the most negative aspects of your experience with the Collegial Evaluation Program so far?

13. How could the Collegial Evaluation Program be improved?

14. Would you recommend the Collegial Evaluation Program to another pair of teachers?

Definitely Yes   Yes   Don't Know   No   Definitely No

cut here

SECTION VII

ADAPTING COLLEGIAL EVALUATION FOR TEACHER TRAINEES

The use of the collegial evaluation process is not limited to elementary and secondary teachers. It can easily be adapted for use by college and university teachers or by teacher trainees. It can even be used among school principals; they, like teachers, rarely receive evaluations designed to help them improve their performance. In fact, the process can conceivably be applied with benefit for any group of professionals, since even lawyers and doctors, once they leave their preservice training, rarely receive adequate feedback from peers. In this section we show how collegial evaluation can be used in teacher-training programs.

Our experience with other methods that have been used to evaluate the teaching interns in Stanford University's Secondary Teacher Education Program convinces us that our program is superior in many respects. Collegial evaluation will: (a) produce more feedback and guidance to trainees than other programs, (b) provide multiple sources of evaluation for each trainee, (c) reduce trainees' anxiety concerning evaluation, (d) develop positive attitudes toward evaluation, and (e) expose trainees to an evaluation process that they can continue to use throughout their teaching careers.

Evaluating student teaching is one of the most difficult tasks of preservice training. Observations and conferences take time, and evaluators are rarely able to give trainees as much feedback as trainees need for their professional growth. Typically, supervisors from the training institution evaluate a number of trainees in different schools and therefore visit each trainee infrequently. Classroom Master Teachers must juggle many other demands on their daily schedules in order to meet occasionally with the student teacher.

At present, the trainees' major source of feedback about their teaching performance is the classroom Master Teacher. Very often their only role model for teaching is the same Master Teacher. Some trainees are fortunate in working with Master Teachers who are both competent teachers and fine evaluators. Others are not so fortunate, for the skills do not necessarily go together. Yet even under the best of circumstances, trainees must rely almost exclusively on one person as a model and source of feedback in fashioning their own teaching styles.

This situation helps to explain the anxiety trainees feel about evaluation. They have good reason to be anxious. Trainees rarely know what criteria are being used to evaluate them. If they do not get along harmoniously with their Master Teacher or if they express disagreement about teaching strategies, they may feel doomed to receive a poor evaluation. A negative assessment made on days when the teacher is not up to par or there are unusual circumstances may be irreversible--the supervisor probably will not have time to observe that trainee again. It is not surprising that trainees typically view evaluation as a process designed to weed out the grossly incompetent, rather than as a constructive part of their training. Trainees subjected to such an essentially punitive evaluation system may well remain hostile to evaluation when they become teachers.

The need for new ways to evaluate teacher trainees arises because of problems endemic to the present system, in sum: limited information;

infrequent observation; insufficient feedback and guidance; evaluation based on vague or unstated criteria; anxiety during evaluation; and resulting negative attitudes toward evaluation on the part of teacher trainees.

How Does the Collegial Evaluation Program Benefit Trainees?

Our Collegial Evaluation Program as modified for trainees is intended to improve the quality of evaluation without adding to the burden of the Master Teacher or the Program Supervisor. Each trainee is assigned to work with a partner. The partners evaluate one another's teaching, guided by their Master Teachers and Program Supervisors. We assume (based on our experience with the pilot test) that trainees will be more likely to share their doubts and worries with one another than with supervisors because of their equal status. These relationships can be very supportive as trainees discover that their problems are not unique and that they can pool their knowledge to help solve their problems.

The chief purpose of the Collegial Evaluation Program is to facilitate the professional development of teachers; thus, the emphasis is on improving teaching, rather than on simply rating the teacher or trainee. By using this program to evaluate themselves and other preservice teachers, trainees will acquire skills that will be useful long after they receive their credentials. We believe that the experience trainees will acquire as they participate in collegial evaluation will make that process one of the strongest components of their preservice training. The experience of identifying goals by asking "What do I want to accomplish this quarter or in this unit?" is usually an exercise reserved for philosophy of education courses and is seldom integrated with the day-to-day objectives of the teacher or trainee in the classroom. The practical setting should make it more feasible to do the hard thinking required to identify one's goals. Below we describe the specific skills trainees can develop at each stage of the evaluation process.

1. Trainees will learn how to select valid criteria to measure progress toward their goals. Through practice, the trainee will acquire a conception of the universe of possible criteria and skill in selecting appropriate ones.
2. As observers, trainees will see teaching that is worthy of emulation and teaching that is not. By being observed, they will become comfortable with working in a classroom that is not isolated (especially useful for trainees who eventually teach in open-space buildings or on teaching teams). In the future they may be more likely to ask a colleague to look in on their classes to help them assess problems and formulate strategies to improve their teaching.
3. Trainees will learn to diagnose strengths and weaknesses in teaching performances, and will get experience in criticizing others, accepting criticism, and evaluating the judgments of others.
4. Student evaluations can be threatening for trainees, just as for teachers. Soliciting student opinions by means of a questionnaire may encourage trainees to accept feedback from students and may help them learn to evaluate students' judgments.
5. Completing the Self-Assessment Forms provides experience in diagnosing in a formal way one's own strengths and weaknesses.
6. Trainees will learn to integrate feedback from students, fellow trainees, and themselves to determine where they need improvement. In conferences with their partner they will get experience in formulating practical and specific strategies for improving their performances and in setting new criteria for assessing their progress.

To summarize, this process of collegial evaluation provides trainees with two of the essential skills of the teacher--diagnosis and prescription.

Using the Collegial Evaluation Program in Preservice Training

Teacher trainees can implement the Collegial Evaluation Program in the same way as in-service teachers, with the difference that a member of the training staff also participates in most of the steps. We think supervisors have a lot to contribute to the program, but as our field test confirmed, trainees can implement the program on their own.

Assigning partners. The training staff may want to assign partners among teacher trainees. Student teachers who are matched by subject area or grade level might help one another more than trainees in dissimilar situations. Another possibility is to assign partners according to the complementary strengths they have demonstrated in the classroom; these trainees can serve as role models for one another, modeling positive behaviors that are lacking in their partner's performance. The training staff might also use the background of trainees as a criterion for assigning partners. The perspectives of people coming from different ethnic, geographic, socioeconomic, or age groups might enrich the quality of information trainees share during the evaluation process.

Another way to broaden the base of the trainee's information about his or her teaching is to bring in a regular classroom teacher or a third trainee to observe and to participate in the conferences. The function of this additional person is described under the Second Conference in Section V.

Selecting criteria. After partners are assigned, trainees meet to select the criteria they will use in their reciprocal evaluations. The input of experienced teachers is crucial in this step of the process. Too often, platitudes which defy observation are used in evaluating teachers. The criteria trainees select should be specific and observable. We provided some illustrative criteria in Section III of this manual; supervisors will be able to supplement this list. Since trainees need help in selecting criteria that will focus their observations, it is highly desirable that the Master Teacher and the Training Program

Supervisor attend this meeting. If they are unable to attend, they should review the criteria the trainees select and discuss any necessary changes with trainees as soon as possible.

Self-evaluation and student evaluation. Trainees should not require assistance in administering the Student Questionnaire or completing the Self-Assessment Forms since procedures for these steps are spelled out in Sections II and IV; but they may require assistance in interpreting these forms and obtaining maximum information from them. Supervisors should help trainees understand discrepancies between their self-evaluation and their students' assessments. Gaining useful insights from students while avoiding either a deflated or an inflated ego is a tricky process that the trainee often cannot manage alone.

Trainees may also need help in understanding discrepancies between their partner's evaluation and their self-evaluation. The trainees should have the opportunity to discuss these discrepancies in private. If they are unable to come to a satisfactory understanding, one of the supervisors should be available to mediate disagreements.

Observations and conferences. The Collegial Evaluation Program requires a minimum of two full class periods for observation and three conferences, one after each observation and one for preparing the Professional Development Plan. Neither the Master Teacher nor the Training Program Supervisor should observe the trainee at the time of observation by another trainee; two observers at once might generate too much anxiety for the trainee. We also recommend that trainees hold their first two conferences in private. In these conferences they can share their impressions of one another's strengths and weaknesses on the basis of their observations. If a supervisor were present, trainees might form a mutual protection society and soften their assessments of one another. Both supervisors will have ample opportunity to contribute their input at the final conference and at individual conferences.

The Plan for Professional Development. The main purpose of the final conference of the trainee partners is to develop a program for the continued improvement of teaching. The trainees integrate the variety of information they have received on the Summary of Observations and Suggestions for Improvement. They discuss this summary with the group, developing a tentative plan for improvement based on the diagnosis of their performances.

We strongly recommend that both the Master Teacher and the Training Program Supervisor participate in this conference. Their task is to help each trainee "evaluate the evaluation." They will review with each trainee discrepancies among the different sources of evaluation and discuss their strengths and weaknesses. In addition, they will help trainees locate any resources needed to carry out their plan. Probably their most critical function of this conference is to help the trainee decide how to implement and evaluate proposed plans for improvement.

Summary

The need to develop new ways to evaluate student teaching becomes very apparent when one listens, as we have done, to students who have experienced evaluation programs. Teacher trainees are full of anxiety about being evaluated and doubtful that the process will improve their teaching. In most programs evaluators are also unhappy because they do not have enough time to do a thorough job. Ultimately, it is pupils in schools who are shortchanged if their future teachers do not receive adequate feedback during training.

The Collegial Evaluation Program is an attempt to overcome many of these problems and to improve the quality of teaching by means of improved evaluation. By broadening the usual evaluation process to include evaluation by peers, pupils, and self, the amount of feedback trainees receive is increased without overburdening the supervising teachers. Active participation by trainees in selecting criteria, interpreting students' responses, observing and conferring with one another, and formulating their own diagnoses and plans for improvement provides them with a number of skills to use throughout their careers. The fact that the trainees play an important part in the process and are able to share their feelings with one another should reduce anxiety and generate more positive attitudes toward the evaluation of teaching.

CONCLUSION: IMPROVING THE COLLEGIAL PROCESS

We are now close to the end of the beginning. After this entire Collegial Evaluation Program has been completed, one can hope that each teacher has set new professional goals and is moving toward their realization. Dedicated teachers will perceive the process of evaluation as an integral part of their own further development.

Because evaluation is a necessary component of professional improvement, we conclude this manual by asking each teacher, each pair of teaching colleagues, and each group of participants in the collegial process to assist that process itself. By doing so, you increase the probability of continued improvement for yourself and also provide a mechanism for improving the application of the collegial process for other teachers. We would appreciate receiving reports of your experiences with collegial evaluation. We can improve only if you evaluate us by commenting on the process we have devised. Write to the authors at Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, School of Education, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305.